Kshatriyas and would-be Kshatriyas

Kumar Cheda Singh Varma

PRESENTATION COPY.

KSHATRIYAS

AND

WOULD-BE KSHATRIYAS

p. 35: Gate on the Kshatriyas.



Allahabad:
Printed at the Pioneer Press

1904.

KSHATRIYAS

AND

WOULD-BE KSHATRIYAS.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN HINDU CASTES TO RANK WITH THE RÁJPUTS, THE DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT KSHATRIYAS.

BY

KUMAR CHEDA SINGH VARMA, B.A.,

OF LINCOLN'S INN

BARRISTER-AT-LAW, AGRA,

ADVOCATE OF THE ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT.

ALLAHABAD

PRINTED AT THE PIONEER PRESS

1904

Copies obtainable from the author. Price Re. 1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PART I.

THE KSHATRIYAS OR RÁJPUTS.

APPENDIX A.

APPENDIX B.

PART II.

THE KHATRIS.

APPENDIX C. PAGE.

PART III.

THE KAYASTHAS.

PART IV.

THE JATS AND KURMIS.

APPENDIX D.

LIST OF WORKS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

LIST OF WORKS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

Apte, V. S.—English-Sanskrit Dictionary, 1884.

Asiatic Researches, vols. v, XV.

Baines, J. A., C.S.I.—Paper on Indian Census Gleanings, 1903.

Bhattacharya, Pandit J. N., M.A., D.L.—Hindu Castes and Sects, 1892.

Bhandarkar, Dr. R. G.—Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1901.

Buchanan, Dr. F.—Statistical Survey, 2 vols., 1870.

Calcutta Review, vols. XV, XCI, CXVI.

Census of India, 1865.

" " 1891 (J. A. Baines, C.S.I.)

" " 1901 (H.H. Risley, C.S.I., & A.E. Gait, C.S.)

Census Report, 1901, Bengal, (A. E. Gait, C.S.)

" " " Bombay. (R. E. Enthoven, C.S.)

" " " N.-W. P. & Oudh (R. Burn, C.S.)

" " " Punjab (H. A. Rose, C.S.)

Chand Bardai.—Prithi Raj Raisa.

Cowell, Prof. E. B.—Elphinstone's History of India, 1874.

Crooke, W.—Tribes & Castes of the N.-W. P. & Oudh, 4 vols., 1896.

Cunningham, Genl. A.—Ancient Geography of India, 1871.

Davids, Prof. R. T. W.—Buddhist India, 1903.

Deb, Raja Sir R. K., K.C.S.I.—Sabda Kalpadruma.

Duncker, M.—History of Antiquity, 5 vols,, 1880-81.

Dutt, R. C., C.I.E.—Ancient India, 3 vols., 1889.

Elliot, Sir H. M.—Races of the N.-W. P., 2 vols., 1869.

Fallon, S. W.—Hindustani-English Dictionary, 1879.

Garbe, Prof. R.—Philosophy of Ancient India, 1899.

Gladwin, F.—Ain-i-Akbari, 2 vols., 1783.
Haughton, Sir G. C.—Institutes of Manu. 2 vols., 1825.
Hopkins, Prof. E. W.—Religions of India, 1896.
Hunter, Dr. W. W., K.C.S.I.– Indian Empire. 1892.
Ibbetson, Sir D., K.C.S.I.—Punjab Ethnography, 1883.
"Imad-ul Sádat." The—
Imperial Gazetteer of India.
Indian Antiquary, 1872, 1873.
Indian Law Reports, Calcutta Series, vols. VII, X.
Jarrett, Col. J. H.—Ain-i-Akbari, 3 vols.. 1889—94.
"Jatimálá." The—
Kalhana, Pandit.—Rája Tarangini.
Kalidas.—Mirch-Kataka.
Kayastha Pamphlets.
Khatri Pamphlets.
Kitts, E. J., C.S.—Compendium of the Castes and Tribes found in India. 1885.
Levi, M. Sylvain.—Doctrine du sacrifice chez les Bráhmanas, 1898.
Máhábharat. The—
Malcolm, Sir J.—Memoir of Central India, 2 vols., 1823.
M'Crindle, J. W.—Ancient India:—Megasthenes and Arrian, 1877.
" " —Ancient India by Ptolemy, 1885.
" " —The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, 1893.
" " —Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature, 1901.
Monier-Williams, Sir W.—Sanskrit Dictionary.
Moore's Indian Appeals, vol. VII.
Nesfield, J. C.—Brief View of the Caste System of the N.-W. P. and Oudh, 1885.
Origin of the Kayasthas.—Anon.
Oudh Gazetteer.
Panini.—Ashta-Dhiai.

Platts, J. D.—Urdu and Hindi Dictionary, 1884
Puranas. The—
Ragozin, Z. A.—Vedic India, 1895.
Risley, H. H., C.S.I.—Tribes and Castes of Bengal, 2 vols., 1891.
Saraswati, Swami Dayananda.—Yajur Veda Bhashya.
Sarkar, S. C.—Vyawastha Durpan, 1867.
Sherring, M. A.—Hindu Tribes and Castes, 3 vols., 1872-79.
Singh, Raja Lachman—Bulandshahr Memoirs.
Stocqueler, J. H.—Handbook of British India, 1854.
Tagore Law Lectures, 1870.
"Tarikh Farishta." The—
"Tashrih-ul-Aqvám." The—
Tod, Col. J.—Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, 2 vols, 1829.
Upanishads. The—
Ushna Smriti.
Valmiki.—The Rámáyana.
Vyás Smriti.
Vyawasthas.
Ward, Rev. W.—A View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindus, 4 vols., 1817-20.
Warren, H. C.—Buddhism in Translations, 1900.
Wheeler, J. T.—History of India, 1884.
Wilson, Prof. H. H.—Glossary of Judicial & Revenue Terms, 1855.
Yagnavalkya.

INTRODUCTION.

INTRODUCTION.

1.—The "Four" Castes.

After more than a century of British rule and Western culture in India it is much to be regretted that so much importance still attaches, among the people of the country, to the question of caste; nay, it is even found that modern education and enlightenment are made, by certain sections of the community, to serve the purpose of advancing their respective claims. In these circumstances, no apology need be made for throwing some light on the origin and social position of some of these caste divisions of the Indian people.

About three years ago the Census Commissioner in India (The Hon. Mr. H H. Risley, C.S., C.S.I.) directed that, for the Census of India, 1901, a scheme should be drawn up classifying the various Hindu castes under the four groups of Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras; and assigning to each caste in these groups its proper position according to the order of social precedence The members of certain castes which have, hitherto, in an undefined sort of way, been striving to rise in the social scale eagerly seized the opportunity thus afforded them of having their pretensions to a higher status placed on record and, if possible, stamped with the hall-mark of official recognition.[1] In the controversy that ensued no

1. *E.g.* An association with the somewhat redundant title of "The Hindu Mair and Tank Kshatriya Rajput Sabha" of Lahore, and representing the well-known caste of Sonars, makes the following significant statement in its address to H. M. the King-Emperor on the occasion of the Coronation Durbar at Dehli:—" In early times we occupied the same high position in society as our brother-Rajputs. But under pressure of many vicissitudes we were driven to making our living by some handicraft. We generally preferred working in precious metals. Hence we came to be called Sonars (or jewel-makers) by the populace . . . . To-day, by the grace of the Almighty *and the help of British officers*, we have regained what we had almost lost, our Rajput prestige and title."

subject was more warmly discussed, on both sides, than the claims of certain castes to be considered "twice-born;" and, in particular, to belong to the Kshatriya order. Among the numerous aspirants to Kshatriyanic honours, who claim equality with the descendants of the Kshatriyas of old, are found the Khatris, the Kayasthas, the Jats, and the Kurmis: to the consideration of whose claims the following pages are devoted; and it must be here remarked that nothing that is advanced in these pages is to be construed as having been set down with the intention of offending the susceptibilities of the communities in question.

However interesting and valuable, from an historical as well as a sociological point of view, the grouping of the existing Indian castes under the ancient fourfold system might prove to the student of Indian affairs, the numerous changes that have been wrought during the lapse of centuries, coupled with the extremely complex organisation of the caste system itself, are sufficient to render the attempt futile and well-nigh impracticable. More than thirty years ago, Mr. J. Beames, C.S., characterised the attempt as "a most inopportune piece of pedantry or ignorance, I know not which."[2] Among later writers, Mr. Nesfield, referring to "the old semi-mythical division of caste," and to the two lower castes, in particular, says:—

"The caste system of the present day is something entirely different, and the attempts that have been made to adapt existing castes to the classifying frame-work of Vaishya and Sudra have resulted in nothing but confusion and failure."[3]

Sir Denzil Ibbetson is of opinion that the fourfold system of classification is one of the popular errors about Hindu caste[4]; and Mr. Risley himself,

2. Sir H. M. Elliot's "Races of the N.-W. P," Vol. 1, App. A., p. 166.
3. "Brief View of the Caste System of the N-W .P. and Oudh,' p. 5.
4. Punjab Ethnography, p. 172.

about thirteen years ago, confessed that "we do not know enough about these primitive groups to be able to apply to their internal structure that minute analysis which alone can determine their precise tribal affinities;" and distinctly declared that "*all speculations which profess to connect existing castes with the four traditional castes are on the face of things futile and misleading.*"[5] The latest writer on the subject, Mr. Crooke, holds that "the primitive so-called divisions of the people into Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras does not agree with existing facts, and these terms do not now denote definite ethnological groups."[6]

The extremely knotty nature of the whole subject of Indian caste is universally admitted. "There are few questions," says Mr. Crooke, "within the whole sphere of Indian sociology which present more difficulty than those connected with caste."[7] Nay, no two experts are as yet agreed as to what constitutes the essential elements of "a caste," or, in other words, what the precise definition of the term ought to be.

2.—The Ethnic Element in Caste.

The ethnological aspect of caste, again, adds another element of perplexity; and from the inherent difficulty of the subject it is not to be wondered at that speculative theories and far-fetched conjectures, based on a real or fancied resemblance of names, should have been freely indulged in.

"It is much to be regretted that the opinion of some of the highest and soundest authorities should not have had the effect of restraining those speculations about Indo-Scythians, and the like, which some

5. "Tribes and Castes of Bengal." Chap. on Khatris.
6. "Castes and Tribes of the N-W. P. and Oudh." Vol. I., Introd. p. XXVI.
7. *Ibid*, Vol. I., Introd. p. IX

English writers so largely indulge in; mere verbal resemblance is, especially in Indian Philology, the most unsafe of all arguments"—"especially when the words on which reliance is placed come to us mangled beyond recognition by Greeks or Chinese."[8] Mr. Nesfield gives an instance in point:—The Gujars have been identified "with the Tochari, *alias* Yuchi, *alias* Kushan, *alias* Kaspiroi, *alias* Thagarii, *alias* Kuei-Shwang, *alias* Korson, Korsea, Khuransu, or Koruna; and in this way they are lodged at last in the city of Khorasan and traced to a Scythian origin."[9]

3.—Caste Status.

Some reference to the pretensions of certain castes to a higher status than that usually accorded them is made by Dr. Hunter in his "Indian Empire,"[10] and Mr. Crooke informs us that "The Shastras and other religious literature of the Brahmans have in recent years been ransacked by a number of castes, whose so-called Aryan origin is more than doubtful, to support a claim to kindred with races whose descent is universally admitted."[11] "Every caste," wrote Mr. J. White, C S., in 1872, "which cannot explain its origin, invariably invents the Kshatriya theory of paternity;"[12] and the Puranic legend of Parasuram is näively produced to do duty for all and sundry: indeed, one is almost led to conclude that, were it not for the doughty deeds of this Puranic hero, there would at the present day have scarcely been any castes below the rank of Kshatriyas!

8. Sir H. M. Elliot's "Races of the N.-W. P.," Vol. I., p. 133 footnote, and p. 137.

9. Nesfield's "Brief View of the Caste System," p. 12.

Mr. Risley has recently propounded a theory that makes the Mahrattas represent the Scythian element in India. Census of India, 1901, pp. 512—514.

10. "Indian Empire," p. 246.

11. "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh," Vol. I., Pref. p. 6.

12. Indian Antiquary, 1872, p. 289.

The following passages from Mr. Crooke's voluminous work so ably treat of the points in question that it would be difficult, and indeed superfluous, to add a single line to them: "The *novus homo*, like his brethren all the world over, is constantly endeavouring to force his way into a higher grade and acquire the privileges of the twice-born. . . . Thus the Raj Gonds, who, in appearance, obstinately retain the Turanian type, in aspiration are Hindus of the Hindus, wearing the sacred cord and carrying ceremonial refinement to the highest pitch of parvenu purism."[13] "There is a constant tendency for tribes as they rise in the social scale to adopt the Brahmanical gotras, because it is a respectable fact to belong to one of them. Thus all the stricter Hindu castes, like Baniyas, Khatris, and even Kayasthas, recognise the gotra The fiction of the common descent from the eponymous ancestor naturally disappears, and among such people the gotra has no higher significance than the pedigree worked up to order in the Heralds' College, which ranks the *novus homo*, through the use of a common crest and coat-of-arms, with the great houses of Cavendish, Russell, or Howard."[14] "Much of the caste nomenclature is taken from that of the famous Rajput septs who employed or protected the menial peoples. No names recur more often among the sections of the inferior castes than Chauhan, Gaharwar, Gahlot, Barjugar, Rathaur, Kachhawaha, Jadon, and Tomar, which possibly represent the serfs and helots attached to them."[15]

4.—The Criterion of Caste Status.

The crucial test, after all, in examining claims to rank or status, whether social or political, is the

13. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh," Vol. I. Introd. p. xix.
14. *Ibid.* Vol. I. Introd. p. clxvii.
15. *Ibid* Vol. I. Introd. p. clxv.

admission or non-admission of the claimants into the class or society to which they aspire to belong. An individual might conclusively prove to his own satisfaction that, for instance, he is entitled to the privilege of a private interview with the Viceroy of India, or that he has the right to a peerage; but if the Viceroy or the House of Lords, as the case may be, refuses to admit him to the rank and privileges he claims, his pretensions are visionary and unavailing. Similarly in matters of caste, *none are Kshatriyas who are not admitted to be Kshatriyas by the Kshatriyas themselves.* The Khatri who would fain rank himself with the Sesodias of Meywar, with the Jadus of Karauli, or with the Bhatis of Jaisalmere, still remains a Panjabi Bania; and no species of argument will ever transform the quill-driving caste of Kayasthas into a Rajput clan. It is rather late in the day for these would-be Kshatriyas to claim a higher status than that which for centuries past they have been entitled to, and have accepted without question.

According to the Hindu Shastras mankind was from the beginning created into four castes, and all the races and nations of the world belonged originally to one or other of these four groups. It was through the neglect of their religious and social observances that the other races forfeited the rank and privileges of Hindus; nay, the very Rakshasas of Hindu mythology were invariably either Brahmans or Kshatriyas by birth, but through their having adopted a different mode of life they were reckoned as outcasts. If the Japanese or the Chinese were to claim a Hindu origin by tracing their descent to the Sun or to the Moon, they would, on the same grounds, be refused admission into the Hindu community.

5.—The Census Reports for 1901.

Some of the Provincial Reports of the Census of 1901 afford us glimpses of the success or otherwise of Mr. Risley's scheme for the classification of castes according to their social precedence. In Bombay the castes have been classified according to current usage, and not according to what the Census Superintendent (Mr. R.E. Enthoven, C.S.) calls "a faint shadow of a possible scheme of division formulated in the dim ages of the past, when differences of race, function, religion, and locality had not yet been permitted to leave their mark on the formation of society as it appears to us at the present day." The Punjab Report says:—"The attempt to classify castes in the order of their social precedence was doomed to failure from the outset." For Bengal, as a province, the scheme was found quite impracticable.[16] The United Provinces appear to be the only area in respect of which Mr. Risley's scheme has been carried out more or less in its entirety, and even here the Census Superintendent (Mr. R. Burn, C.S.) admits that "there is considerable doubt whether certain castes are twice-born or not, and even amongst castes admitted to be Sudras distinctions in social rank are recognized;" and as regards the opinions of the district committees that were consulted on the subject he states that "there are some castes about which there was considerable difference of opinion."[17]

The scheme of Mr. Risley, who in his Circular had referred to the system adopted by Mr. Baines, C.S.I., the Census Commissioner for 1891, as "a patchwork classification,"[18] has elicited from the latter the following remarks in the course of an address delivered in London before the Society of Arts on the 26th February, 1903:—"I venture to

16. Census Reports, 1901, Bombay, Bengal, Punjab.
17. Census Report, 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh p. 217.
18. Circular of Census Superintendent, N.-W. P. and Oudh, dated 25th February 1901.

think that . . . . there is no serious difference in opinion among experts in the subject which is not involved in this scheme, and the application of it to existing facts, where it has been adopted, so far as the reports have reached me, appear to confirm that view."[19]

The Census Report of 1901, for all India, just published, gives the results of the new scheme of caste-classification attempted by the Census Commissioner. They consist of 10 pages of "Social Statistics,"[20] in which the whole of India is divided up into seven ethnological areas, each comprising from two to six of the ordinary administrative divisions of the country. The caste-classifications differ with each ethnological area, and in some instances are different even for separate portions of the same province; *e.g.*, Bengal, Behar and Orissa have each a system of its own. There are in all about a dozen systems of caste grouping, no two of which are alike; each group containing from three to as many as thirteen "classes," varying from the simple "high," "low," and "intermediate" castes of Assam and its neighbourhood, to the more complex list of twelve classes in the United Provinces, with the Brahman at one end of the social scale and the beef-eater at the other. Some of these "classes," again, are further sub-divided into two or more "sub-classes" according to occupation, and last of all come the caste-names themselves—in alphabetical order, "so as to escape the necessity of settling the more delicate question of precedence!" Such, in the briefest possible form, is a verbal description of the system adopted in the present report, which pronounces that of 1891 "a patchwork classification in which occupation predominates, varied here and there by considerations of caste,

---

19. Reported in the "Pioneer" of March 30th, 1903.
20. Census of India, 1901, Vol. I, pp. 559—569.

history, tradition, ethnical affinity, and geographical position."[21] But we have identically the same elements of classification in the new scheme—only differently applied, ethnology predominating instead of occupation: it is but another throw of the same dice, another shuffle of the same cards. The remarks of Mr. Risley that the system of 1891 "does not help us in the least towards presenting an intelligible picture of the social grouping of that large population of the people of India which is organised, admittedly or tacitly, on the basis of caste,"[22] might therefore with as much truth be applied to his own scheme, which is indeed more elaborate, and perhaps more scientific, but certainly more complicated and less intelligible. Beyond recording the already widely-known fact that the Brahman heads the list of Hindu castes in India, and that the sweepers and scavengers are at the bottom of the social scale, these "Social Statistics" cannot be said to give the reader any definite idea of the relative social position of the 2,000 and more Hindu castes found within the limits of the Indian Empire.

In the following pages the origin and position of the Rajputs will first be set forth; and the claims of the Khatris, the Kayasthas, the Jats, and the Kurmis will be discussed in order. A table at the end (Appendix D) shows at a glance the numerical strength and distribution of these castes throughout India.

---

21. Census of India, 1901, Vol. I, p. 538.
22. *Ibid*, Vol. I, p. 537.

PART I.

THE KSHATRIYAS OR RAJPUTS.

PART I.

THE KSHATRIYAS OR RAJPUTS.

1.—"Kshatriya," "Rajput," "Chhatri," "Thakur."

If the class name of the second or royal caste of the Hindus be traced from the Vedic period down to the present time, it will be found that the word "Rájaniya" is used to designate them in the Vedas; and sometimes the word "Kshattra" (क्षत्र) is used in the same sense. In the time of the Sutras, the word "Kshatriya" comes in, and in the earlier Hindi literature the word is changed into "Chhattree," "Thakúr," or "Rájput". All these terms are synonymous, and there never was a time when "Rájput", or "Chhattree", or "Thakúr" was employed in contradistinction to "Kshatriya."

The name "Rájput" consists of two parts, "Ráj" and "put," both of which are of Sanskrit origin: राजपुत्र. But before discussing the meanings and application of the word Rájput, it must be pointed out that it is, like Kshatriya, an ancient appellation of the caste. It occurs in Panini's "Ashta Dhiai" along with "Rajaniya," the Vedic word for "Kshatriya."[1] It is also used in the "Mahabharata,"[2] in the Ramayana of Valmiki[3], and in the Puranas.[4]

It will be found that the word "Rájput" as used in ancient Sanskrit Literature conveys two meanings, *i.e.*, it is synonymous with the words (1) "Kshatriya" and (2) "Rajkumar." Swami Dayananda Saraswati, the founder of the Arya Samaj, who was one of the most learned Sanskrit scholars and most

---

1. Panini's "Ashta-Dhiai." Book IV., Chap. II, Sutra 39.
2. Mahabharata—Birat Parva, Chap. XLI,, Slokas 1 and 2.
3. Ramayana—Sundar Kand. Sarga 38, Sloka 60.
4. Agni Purana—Chap. CCXXV, Sloka 1.

profound grammarians, gives the word "Rájputra" as equivalent to the word "Rajaniya,"[5] and the word "Rajaniya" is explained by using the word "Kshatriya".[6] From this, the highest modern authority, it is clear that Rájputra is equivalent to "Kshatriya." The word Kshatriya is derived from the word "Kshattra" by adding the affix 'घ,'[7] which always comes in in the sense of "descendants." It is therefore quite clear that the derivation, as well as the use, of the two words points to the same conclusion, *viz.*, that "Kshatriya" and "Rájputra" are both used in the sense of "the descendants of royalty," and that they are class names. In support of this we find in the Mahabharata :—

अध्यर्ता राजपुत्राणां क्रन्दतां मितरेतरम्
प्रादुरासीन् महाशब्दो भीरूणां भयवर्धनः ॥
महाभा. द्रोणपर्वणि अभिमन्युव. अ ४१ श्लोक २१

आत्मोदैवे तथेष्टौ च समुपासन गुणार्थिनः
ब्राह्मणा राजपुत्राश्च कथं मृत्युमाहृतः ॥

In these two slokas, "Rájputra" is used in the same sense as "Kshatriya." The following quotation from "Tashrih-ul-Aqvam" (تشريح الاقوام) also proves this :—

وچهتري چهت بمعني زخم تري بمعني رچها يعني حفاظت است
لفظ اصلي بزبان سنسكرت كشتري است عوام چهتري ميگويند و در
شاستر راج پوتر هم ايشان را نامند يعني فرزند راجها و در بهاكها مخفف
آن راجپوت راج بمعني راجه وپوت بمعني پسر است *

The other sense in which "Rájputra" is used is "Rajkumar" or prince. In the Ramayana, the "Agni Purana," the "Mahabharata," and the "Kaurendra Niti," the word is used in this sense. राजपुत्र, "A king's son ; prince."[8] We find therefore that the

5. Yajur Veda—Chap XXXI, Hymn 2.
6. *Ibid.*—Chap 29, Hymn 2.
7. Panini's "Ashta-Dhiai," Book IV., Chap. I., Sutra 138.
8. Monier-Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, p. 839, col. III.

word Rájput is persistently used for a large section of the Hindu community whose past history and present position entitle them to be called Kshatriyas.

Some European Scholars, as well as some of the Persian historians, are led away by the idea that the word "Rájput" is used in contradistinction to the word "Kshatriya" or "Chhatri." But such is not the case. "Kshatriya" or "Chhatri," and "Thakur" and "Rájput" are applied indiscriminately to one and the same class. In some parts of the country the people prefer the name "Thakur" to that of "Rájput," but they never discard the word "Kshatriya" or "Chhatri." In reality the words "Rájput" and "Thakur" (which is the same as the Sanskrit "Thakura"[9], ठक्कुर) are assumed by the Kshatriyas as honorific titles. The former is more generally used, because it conveys the idea of noble descent, as well as that of ancient origin; and the classes thus designated are the only true representatives of the ancient Kshatriyas.

Another variant for Kshatriya or Chhatri is "Khatri," which will be noticed in Part II., p. 41.

2.—Some opinions on the caste of the Rajputs.

The following extracts from standard works conclusively prove that the terms "Kshatriya," "Chhattree," and "Thakur" are used indiscriminately for the Rájput community of India:—

The Census Report of 1865:—

(1) "Kshatriyas," Chhattrees, or Rájputs."[10]

(2) "Rájput, 2319; Thakurs 87; Rájputs (king's descendants) and Thakur (lord of land) are terms of respect for Kshatriyas."

(3) "Thakur (primary caste)."[11]

9. Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, p. 356.
10. Census Report, 1865, p 8.
11. *Ibid*, pp. 33, 38.

(4) "Chhattrees; various tribes sprung from this caste will be found in different parts of the district—Gautam, Bais, etc.; Thakurs, Chawhans and Chhattrees are the generic names."[12]

Mr. J. Beames, C. S., says—

"As to Kshatriyas, the Rajputs claim, and with justice apparently, this title, *but no other class has any shadow of a claim.*"[13]

In Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes" we find—"The Kshatriya or Rájput tribes . . . This is the second of the great Hindu castes and is called Kshatriya and Rájput almost indiscriminately."[14] The same author speaks of the four great Hindu castes as Brahmans, *Rájputs*, Vaishyas, and Sudras.[15] In another passage he refers to them as "the high born, pure-blooded, royal Rájput tribes."[16]

Wheeler says of the Kshatriyas—

"They were all Rájputs."[17]

Hunter's "Indian Empire"—

"Their old Sanskrit names Kshatriya, Rajaniya, and Rájbansi, mean connected with the 'royal power,' or 'of the royal line;' their usual modern name, Rajput, means 'of royal descent." The warriors and king's companions, called in ancient time Kshatriyas; at the present day Rájputs."[18] Again., in speaking of the Race Elements of the Indian population, the Brahmans and *Rájputs* of the present day, to the exclusion of all other castes, are specified as constituting the descendants of the ancient Aryans.[19]

W. Crooke in his "Tribes and Castes" writes—"Rájput (Rájputra), son of a king." "The

---

12. Census Report, 1865, p. 128.
13. Sir H. M. Elliot's "Races of the N. W. P.," Vol. I., p. 166.
14. Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. I., Part. II., Chap. I, pp. 115, 117.
15. *Ibid*, Vol III., pp. 246, 261.
16. *Ibid*, Vol. III., p. 181.
17. Wheeler's "Short History of India." p..11, footnote.
18. Hunter's "Indian Empire," pp. 131, 132.
19. *Ibid*, pp. 89-90.

warrior and land-owning race of Northern India, who are known as Thakur, 'lord' (Sanskrit Thakkura), or Chattri, the modern representative of the ancient Kshatriya."[20]

There is a decision of H. M's Privy Council in which it is clearly laid down that Kshatriyas still exist in India and that the Rájputs are considered to belong to that class.[21]

Pandit Jogendra Nath Bhattacharya, M.A., D.L., in his well-known work on "Hindu Castes and Sects," writes as follows :—"The Rájputs are admitted by all to be true Kshatriyas and are not to be confounded with the Kshettris (Khatris) of the Punjab, who are usually regarded as Baniyas."[22]

Mr. R. Burn, C.S., Superintendent of the Census Operations 1901, for the N.-W. P. and Oudh, in his Report recently published, says :—"Group III. Kshatriya.—The representatives of the second division of Manu according to the universal opinion at the present day in these provinces are the Rájputs, Thakurs, and Chhatris."[23]

In his latest work, "Buddhist India," Professor Rhys Davids, an eminent scholar and well versed in the methods of historical research, makes no distinction whatever between the terms Kshatriya and Rájput, and uses them synonymously throughout.

3.—Origin of the Rajputs.

Colonel Tod maintains that the Rájputs are Kshatriyas, but that there is a mixture of Scythian blood in some of them. Professor Cowell in a learned and lengthy discussion (*vide* Appendix A., page 25)

---

20. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh." Vol. IV., 217.
21. Tagore Law Lectures—1870, p. 773. (*Vide* p. 42.)
22. "Hindu Castes and Sects," p. 317.
23. Census Report, 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh, p. 167.

combats this theory, and says finally: "My conclusion, therefore, is . . . . . . that the Rájputs are all pure Hindus."*

Dr. Hunter refers to these arguments in his "Indian Empire," and summarises the local inquiry of Sir Denzil Ibbetson held in the Punjab. The former says:—"Although Tod is still the standard Historian of Rájputana, and will ever retain an honoured place as an original investigator, his ethnical theories must be received with caution."[24] The conclusions arrived at by Sir Denzil Ibbetson may or may not be true, but as they are admittedly based on a local inquiry in the Punjab, they cannot be of general application. Rájputana being, *par excellence*, the country of the Rájputs, it would be hardly fair to refute the arguments of Professor Cowell by a reference to the ethnical conditions prevalent in the Punjab.

The "Tarikh Farishta" has a tradition that the Rájputs are of illegitimate descent, and that the sons and descendants of Raja Suraj, who is said to have reigned during the sixth century of the Christian era, were especially named Rájputs. In this connection it should be borne in mind that the Rájputs or Kshatriyas of the Solar Race (Surajbansi) assert that they are descended from the Sun-god (Suraj)—an assertion based on the Hindu traditions of prehistoric times, long anterior to the date of the Raja Suraj mentioned by the Persian historian. In the preceding pages it has also been shown that the name Rájput is to be found in ancient Sanskrit Literature: Farishta's "tradition" can therefore only mean that the term came more into vogue as a class designation during the period mentioned. At all events, it is preposterous to suppose that the illegitimacy of Raja

---

* Mr. Risley questions the Scythian origin of the Rajputs; he is of opinion that they are Indo-Aryans of a comparatively pure type.—Census of India, 1901, pp. 508, 509.

24. Hunter's "Indian Empire," p. 227, Note 2.

Suraj's sons can in any way affect the legitimacy of the whole Solar Race.

The "Ain-i-Akbari" and the "Tarikh Farishta" appear to have been written about the same period; but they differ greatly in their conclusions about the Rájputs. It may be mentioned here that there is a class of people living in the districts of Jalaun, Agra (parganas Fatehabad and Bah), and some other districts, called Rujputs (pron rudge-poot) (रजपूत). They are of mixed origin, and the Rájputs have no intercourse with them, and it is believed that Farishta must have been misled by the similarity of name. In the time of the Emperor Akbar some of these Rujpoots (रजपूत) were employed as soldiers. Abul Fazl does not include them among the Rájputs; but it is possible that Farishta may have heard about them, and hence the confusion. The Census Report of 1865 says:—"But Rajput is also the name of a mixed class, descended from a Kshatriya by a Rájnee (washerwoman) mother, according to tradition; and from a Vaishya by an Ambastha woman, according to the Rudrayamala Tantra. The Rájputs and Thakurs enumerated in this (Bijnor) district are not of the latter class." The Tashrih-ul-avqam (تشریح الاقوام) also mentions this class. It says:—

یکی از قوم چهتّری دهرم کرم خود گذاشته بیوه زن قوم مصوّر هادوبخانه انداخت فرزندے بادها ولادت یافت *

در سنسکرت نیون چهتّری دور بهاکها رجپوت رج بمعنی تخم وپوت بمعنی پسر یعنی پون شنکر چهتّری ازین قوم بعضی پیشه نجاری و برخی حرفت معماری و اکثری نغمه‌سرائی و رقاصی و بیدی و آهنگری وغیره اختیار نمودند و خود را رجپوت ظاهر ساختند و میسازند *

Some idea of the anxiety displayed by the Kshatriyas as to the purity of their race may be

gathered from the following remarks of Professor Rhys Davids:—[25]

"Their books constantly repeat a phrase as being common amongst the people, and it was certainly common at least among the Aryan sections of the people which divided all the world, as they knew it, into four social grades, called Colours (Vanná). At the head were the Kshatriyas,[26] the nobles, who claimed descent from the leaders of the Aryan tribes in their invasion of the Continent. They were most particular as to the purity of their descent through seven generations, both on the father's and mother's side; and are described as 'fair in colour, fine in presence, stately to behold.'"[27]

Again:— "The whole episode of the marriage of the Sakiya maiden to Pasenadi, King of Kosala, turns on the belief that a Kshatriya will not eat, even with his own daughter, if she be slave-born."[28]

The Royal Family of Meywar long remained an eye-sore to the Moslems. The struggle against the Mogul dynasty was, to say the least, very distasteful to them. When they saw that the arm of Islam could not triumph over the Hindu sword, they tried to cast aspersions on their rivals by inventing baseless stories about the origin of the Rájputs.

4.—The Character and Position of the Rajputs.

The Rájputs have little to be ashamed of in their past history, and even in the field of intellectual activity they rose to no mean eminence.

Sherring says: "Among the noble houses of the nations of the earth, there are none that can boast of

---

25. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," p. 53.

26. "The warrior caste is now the higher (*i.e.*, than the Brahmans) in public estimation." Warren's "Buddhism in Translations," p. 41.

27. The term "Kshatriya" means a "king, lord, or noble," and the sense in which it is used as a "warrior" is a distorted one, as if the sole duty of a king was only to fight on behalf of the Brahmans.

28. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," p. 58.

a longer pedigree or of a more splendid history than the Rájputs of India."[29]

Col. Tod remarks:—"If we compare the antiquity and illustrious descent of the dynasties which have ruled, and some which continue to rule, the small sovereignties of Rajasthan with many of celebrity in Europe, superiority will often attach to the Rajput. From the most remote periods we can trace nothing ignoble, nor any vestige of vassal origin. Reduced in power, circumscribed in territory, compelled to yield much of their splendour, and many of the dignities of birth, they have not abandoned an iota of the pride and high bearing arising from a knowledge of their illustrious and regal descent."

"We have the evidence of Sir Thomas Roe, the Ambassador of Elizabeth to Jehangir, as to the splendour of this race: it appears throughout their annals and those of their neighbours."[30]

The *Gazetteer* of Oudh pays the following tribute to the Rájput chieftains of the Province:—"It is impossible to think badly of a race who, from among the dozen chiefs of a single district, could produce in one season of national convulsion two such eminent instances of loyalty and devotion to opposite sides as the present Maharaja of Balrampur and the late Raja Debi Baksh Singh of Gonda. The one risked his property and his life to save a handful of English friends, and remained their firm protector when it seemed certain that their cause was lost; the other did not join the standard of revolt till he had escorted the treasure and officials of a Government he hated to a place of safety, who was the last in the field while fighting was possible, and who, though offered honourable reception, and the whole of his immense estate by his conquerors, elected to sacrifice position and wealth, and die a starving exile in

29. Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. I., Pt. II., Chap. I, p. 117.

30. Tod's "Rajasthan," Vol. I., p. 103.

Nepal, rather than desert his defeated mistress. Their fortunes were different but their chivalrous honour the same."[31]

Professor Rhys Davids speaks thus of the Kshatriyas :—"It will sound most amazing to those familiar with Brahmin pretensions (either in modern times in India, or in priestly books such as Manu and the Epics) to hear Brahmins spoken of as 'low-born.' Yet that precisely is an epithet applied to them in comparison with the kings and nobles. And it ought to open our eyes as to their relative importance in early times.

"The fact is that the claim of the priests to social superiority had nowhere in North India been then, as yet, accepted by the people. Even such books of the priests themselves as are pre-Buddhistic imply this earlier, and not the later state of things with which we are so familiar. They claim for the North-Western, as distinct from the easterly Provinces, a most strict adherence to ancient custom. The ideal land is, to them, that of the Kurus and Panchalas, not that of the Kasis and Kosalas. But nowhere do they put forward in their earlier books those arrogant claims, as against the Kshatriyas, which are a distinctive feature of the later literature. The kings are their patrons, to whom they look up, from whom they hope to receive approval and rewards. And it was not till the time we are now discussing that they put forward claims, which we find still vigorously disputed by all Kshatriyas—and by no means only by those of noble birth (a small minority of the whole) who happen also to be Buddhists.

"We find, for instance, that the Jain books take it throughout, as a matter of course, that the priests, as regards social standing, are below the nobles. This was the natural relation between the two, as we find throughout the world."[32]

31. Gazetteer of Oudh, Vol. I. p. XXX. Introd.
32. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," pp. 60, 61.

It has been so much the fashion to place to the credit of the Brahmans all that is most profound in the Philosophy of Ancient India, that it will come as a revelation to many to learn that "the greatest intellectual performances, or rather almost all the performances of significance for mankind, in India, have been achieved by men" [33] who were *not* of the priestly caste. Hindu Philosophy, in all its developments, has been invariably looked upon as being solely and exclusively the "Wisdom of the Brahmans." "But what will be said if it can be proven that the Brahman's profoundest wisdom, the doctrine of the All-One, which has exercised an unmistakable influence on the intellectual life of even our time, did not have its origin in the circle of Brahmans at all?"[34]

"We have abundant evidence," says Professor Rhys Davids, "that this grand generalisation was neither due to the priests who adopted it, nor had its origin in the priestly schools. Precisely as regards the highest point of the generalisation, the very keystone of the arch, the priestly literature has preserved the names of the Rájput laymen who thought it out and taught it to the priests. And among the priests who had the greatest share in adopting it, in procuring admission for it into their sacred books, is mentioned the very Uddálaka Aruni, the Gotama, whose defeat in argument on 'spiritual matters' has been recorded above.

"When this point had been reached speculation on the basis of the soul theory could go no further. The only modification possible was in the ideas as to the nature and qualities of the souls, internal and external, and as to the relations between them. And to this point speculation reached, but later, and less clearly, in China also, and in Greece. But it

---

33. Garbe's "Philosophy of Ancient India," p. 85.
34. *Ibid*, p. 68.

was in India, and in India only, that the further step was taken by Gotama the Rájput and his disciples, to abandon the soul theory altogether; and to build up a new philosophy (whether right or wrong is not here the question) on other considerations in which soul or souls played no part at all.*

"That this thorough-going and far-reaching step was taken by laymen should not surprise us. To suppose that the Indians were more superstitious at that time than other folk, more under the thumb of the priests, is to misunderstand the evidence. On the contrary there was a well-marked lay feeling, a real sense of humour, a strong fund of common sense, a wide-spread feeling in all such matters, of courtesy and liberality. How, otherwise, can we explain the fact, already pointed out, of the most complete and unquestioned freedom, both of thought and expression, which the world had yet witnessed?"[35]

Brahman sources of information have hitherto been too exclusively relied on by the scholars of Europe, but, as Professor Rhys Davids remarks, "the European writers would be perfectly willing to consider other texts if they only had them. They have been perfectly right in using the material before them. And in editing texts they naturally chose first those nearest at hand. But even so, with practically only priestly books to judge by, they are by no means unanimous in accepting the views of those texts as to the exclusive supremacy of the Brahmins in early times."[36]

"They (the Brahmins) have given a completely distorted view of Indian society, and of the place, in it, of the priest. They were not the only learned or the only intellectual men, any more than they

* Schopenhauer comes to the same conclusion; he says "there is no psyche," and replaces it by an "unconscious will."

35. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," pp. 256—258.

36. *Ibid*, p. 150.

were the only wealthy ones. The religion and the customs recorded in their books were not, at any period, the sole religion, or the only customs, of the many peoples of India. The intellectual movement before the rise of Buddhism was in a large measure a lay movement, not a priestly one."[37]

The final triumph of the priestly caste in the great and prolonged struggle for supremacy with the Kshatriyas in bygone ages operated to place the former in the fore-front of Indian Philosophy, but it was in reality the latter that laid the basis for philosophical research.

The ancient Kshatriyas, not content, as a matter of course, with pure Brahmanism or the religion of the sacrificial ritual, which invariably enriched the Brahmans at the expense of others, threw off the yoke of the ceremonials and turned their thoughts to philosophical research which took different forms at different periods—much to the discomfiture of the Brahmans. And the credit of being the first in the world to proclaim Monism belongs to the Kshatriya race. The philosophy of the original Upanishads, "Those famous works which immediately on their appearance in Europe filled the greatest thinkers of the Occident with admiration and enthusiasm,"[38] owes its origin to the Kshatriya brain. The whole subject is lucidly dealt with by Professor Garbe in his "Philosophy of Ancient India.".—(*Vide* Appendix B., p. 33.)*

The Professor's remarks ought, it is earnestly hoped, to give an impetus to the Kshatriya world to turn its thoughts once more to the intellectual development of their illustrious race which now stands in greater need of the qualities of the head than of the might of the arm.

---

37. Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," p. 159.
38. Prof R. Garbe's "Philosophy of Ancient India," p. 69.
* Bhagavat Gita. IV. 1.—"I taught this imperishable yoga to Vivasvat; Vivasvat taught it to Manu; Manu taught it to Ikshvaku."

Without in any way belittling the services of the Brahmans, it should be borne in mind that their intellectual achievements were primarily in defence of their own interests, their activity having been roused by the independent and disinterested thoughts of the Kshatriyas. The endeavours of the Brahmans, like those of the Neo-Platonists, have always been to combine philosophy with religion, but their motives were different. The motive of the former was to safe-guard their class interests, while that of the latter was to establish a Universal Church.

How the princes and nobles of ancient India were unable to hold their own against the Brahmanical clique would need more space than could be afforded here, but the final triumph of the priestly caste resulted in the premature death of Hindu Philosophy; and Science, its daughter, could no longer thrive in India. Any philosophical treatise not consistent with the tenets of Brahmanism was branded as heretical and decried from one end of the Brahmanical world to the other. "The priests have preserved for us, not so much the opinions the people actually held, as the opinions the priests wished them to hold."[39] Philosophy must ever be the handmaid of truth; when devoted to mere class-interests it becomes more like a public harlot.*

It may, moreover, be added that the intellectual achievements of the Kshatriyas, which at

39. Rhys Daivds' "Buddhist India," p. 210.

* Schopenhauer in his Essay on the "Doctrine of the Ideal and Real" makes the following weighty observations anent a system of Philosophy based on self-interest and party feeling; they apply with greater force to the Philosophy of the Brahmans :—"For these lay down as their first condition that the intellect should act on its own account, and during the time of this activity should cease to be in the service of the will, that is, to have the object of one's own personality in view; but when it is itself active simply of its own motion, it, in accordance with its nature, knows no other purpose than the truth. Hence it does not suffice, in order to be a philosopher, which means lover of wisdom (this being nothing else than truth), to love the truth in so far as it harmonizes with one's own interest, or with the will of superiors, or the dogmas of the Church, or the prejudices or tastes of contemporaries; as long as one remains in this position, one is only a φίλαμτος and nο φίλοσοφος."

various times gave birth in India to the various schools of philosophy, have in their entirety been lost to the world, only faint traces of them being found in Brahmanical literature. But for an impartial enquirer Brahmanical literature cannot be the only source from which a correct historical estimate is to be formed. On this point the following passage from Professor Bhandarkar, himself a high-caste Brahman and a distinguished scholar and antiquarian, will throw additional light :—" The period that we have been speaking of (that is, from the beginning of the second century B. C. to the end of the fourth century after) has left no trace of a building or sculpture devoted to the use of the Brahmin religion. Of course, Brahminism existed, and it was probably, during the period, being developed into the form which it assumed in later times. But the religion certainly does not occupy a prominent position, and Buddhism was followed by the large mass of the people from princes down to the humble workman." [40] " And he goes on to say that the language of the earlier inscriptions indicates a greater deference for the people who used it, than for Brahmanic learning."[41] Professor Hopkins is also of the same opinion :—" Brahmanism has always been an island in a sea. Even in the Brahmanic age there is evidence to show that it was the isolated belief of a comparatively small group of minds. It did not even control all the Aryan population." [42] It would require a whole volume to treat of the subject adequately.

The Brahmanical austerities, too, were cast in the same mould as their philosophy. The aim of the Kshatriya saints and sages was towards self-abnegation and perfection of character, while that of the Brahmans of the same cult was self-aggrandizement.

---

40. "Journal" of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1901.
41. Rhys Davids' " Buddhist India," p. 152.
42. Hopkins' " Religions of India," p. 548.

A few instances are given below in the words of Mr. Ward. Though perfectly correct as to the facts, Mr. Ward does not see the other side of the shield—he fails to perceive that the ideal of the Brahmanical saintly life was altogether different from that of the Kshatriyas; the saintly life in India, as a whole, therefore, merits better treatment :—

"Vushishtu inflicted on himself incredible acts of severity, but in the midst of his devotions he became attached to a heavenly courtesan, and cohabited with her five thousand years. Purashuru, an ascetic, violated the daughter of a fisherman who was ferrying him over a river, from which intercourse sprang the famous Vyasu and the author of the Mahabharatu. Kupilu, an ascetic, reduced King Sagurus' sixty thousand sons to ashes, because they mistook him for a horsestealer. Brigoo, in a fit of passion, kicked the god Vishnu in the breast. Richeeku, for the sake of subsistence, sold his son for a human sacrifice. Doorvasa, a sage, was so addicted to anger that he was a terror both to gods and men Ourvvu, another sage, in a fit of anger destroyed the whole race of Hoihuyu with fire from his mouth, and Doovasa did the same to the whole posterity of Krishnu. Javalee, an ascetic, stands charged with stealing cow's flesh at a sacrifice; when the beef was sought for, the saint, to avoid detection, turned it into onions, and hence onions are forbidden to the Hindus. The Pooranus, indeed, abound with accounts of the crimes of these saints, so famous for their religious austerities; anger and lust seem to have been their predominant vices."[43]

Another unsaintly specimen of the saintly life is given in the Devi Bhagavat :*—Once upon a time the rains ceased in India for a period of twelve

---

43. Ward's "View of the History, Literature, and Religion of the Hindus," pp. 286, 287. (The old style of spelling has been retained in the extract.)

* Devi Bhagavat," Skanda 12, Chap. 9.

years, and there was a great famine in the land. The Brahman saints, being reduced to starvation, gathered round Gowtama, the author of the Hindu Logic, Nyaya, and entreated him to relieve their distress. Gowtama cheerfully complied with their request and kept them under his protection. When the famine was at an end the Brahman saints took leave of their protector, but in their hearts they grudged Gowtama the reputation for magnanimity which his benevolence was sure to gain for him. They, therefore, secretly placed a dying cow at the threshold of the room containing Gowtama's fire-altar; and when it died, they attributed its death to him. Gowtama, however, soon solved the mystery and, after reading a severe lesson to the Brahman saints, exclaimed that "to feed vipers on milk could only result in producing snake-poison." The Vishnu Puran distinctly states that this Gowtama was also a Kshatriya by birth, and the feelings of jealousy displayed by the Brahmans towards him give weight to the plea of his Kshatriya origin.[44]

In contrast with the above the character of the undermentioned Kshatriya saints and sages comes into bolder relief:—King Rishaba Deva,[45] though under severe persecution and no inconsiderable provocation at the hands of the advocates for the ceremonials, never betrayed any signs of anger. King Shivi,[46] an ascetic, to ransom the life of a dove, which fell into his lap, gave its pursuer,

44. "The country legends still abound with instances of the conflict between the Rajput and the Brahman in pre-historic times. As a survival of this it may be noted that, in Bundelkhand, Brahmans will not allow the navel string (nára) of Rajput childern to be buried in their villages, lest the latter tribe may some day supplant and dispossess them."—Elliot's "Supplemental Glossary," quoted in Crooke's "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh", Vol. IV., p. 221.

45. Father of King Bharat, after whose name India is called Bharatvarsha by the Hindus He renounced his kingdon and became a great saint. He is considered by the Hindus as one of the 24 Incarnations of Vishnu, and is equally honoured by the Jains as the founder of their religion.—"Bhagavata," Skanda V., Ch. 5. 6.

46. "Mahabharat," Van Parva. Ch. 131.

without the least murmur, an equivalent amount of his own flesh. King Ranti Deva,[47] another ascetic, while tormented with the worst hunger, himself gave the last morsel of his food to a Chandal without a word of discontent; and when the gods appeared before him to confer on him any boon that he might ask, he declined their offer, observing that he did not care even for Moksha (salvation), his only desire being to free the whole world, if possible, from sorrow and pain and to take upon himself all suffering. King Janaka,[48] the renowned sage so frequently mentioned in the Upanishads exclaimed, under the most trying circumstances, in the famous Sanskrit couplet:—"If the whole of my kingdom, Mithila, were on fire, nothing that I can call my own (the balance of my mind) will be lost to me." King Arishta Nemi,[49] an ascetic, spurned the offer of the joys of Heaven in favour of mental tranquillity. And lastly, there is the world-wide reputation of Buddha,[50] whose character needs but little comment.

Thus it will be seen that while the goal of Brahmanical austerities was the attainment of proficiency in the black art, that of the Kshatriya ascetics and sages was to secure a path to Nirvana, or freedom from evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds. "The nearer we get to the time of Buddhism the greater is the importance we find attached to this second method, that of *tapas*—self-mortification, or more exactly self-torture. The word occurs in this its technical sense, in the latest hymns included in the Rig Veda. It is literally 'burning, glow;' and had then already acquired the secondary sense of retirement into solitude in

47. "Bhagavata," Skanda IX. Ch. 21.
48. "Mahabharat," Shanti Parva, Ch. 178.
49. "Yoga Vashista," Vairagya Prakarna, Ch. 1.
50. Gautam Kshatviyas, the clan to which Buddha belonged, are still found in the neighbourhood of Kapilavastu; and the Raja of Nagar in the district of Basti is the local head of the clan.

the forest, and the practice there of austerity, bodily self-mortification,—not at all with the idea of atonement or penance, but under the impression that self-torture of this kind would bring about magical results."[51] "Morality finds no place in this system. Sacrifice, which regulates the relation of man to the divinities, is a mechanical act, operating by its own spontaneous energy (*par son energie intime*); and that, hidden in the bosom of nature, is only brought out by the magic art of the priest."[52]

As regards the purer doctrines of Brahmanism, there is nothing to show that they have not been borrowed from the non-Brahmanical schools of India. Nay, on the contrary, the fact of the ennobling as well as the debasing principles of morality appearing side by side in the Brahmanical code of ethics, affords some ground for the above-mentioned theory. It would appear that a place had been assigned to the higher principles of morality in order to gain the approbation of the thinking minds of the day; and had these principles been allowed to stand by themselves—undistorted by interested motives—the decline of intellectual development in India would, perhaps, not have been the result.

It is indeed a regrettable circumstance that the picture of the saintly life painted by the Brahmanical imagination falls far below the requisite standard; and that the glitter of the intellectual treasure bequeathed by the Brahmans of yore to the India of to-day is not all gold.

---

51 Rhys Davids' "Buddhist India," p. 242.
52. Sylvain Levi's "Doctrine du sacrifice chez les Brahmanas," p. 9.

APPENDIX A.

PROFESSOR COWELL ON "THE ORIGIN OF THE RAJPUTS."

APPENDIX A.

PROFESSOR COWELL ON "THE ORIGIN OF THE RAJPUTS."

"Among the changes in caste, I have not noticed one which, if proved, is of much greater importance than all the rest: I allude to the admission of a body of Scythians into the Kshatriya class which is asserted by Col. Tod, and in part acceded to by a very able writer in the *Oriental Magazine*. Col. Tod is entitled to every respect, on account of his zeal for Oriental knowledge, and the light he has thrown on a most interesting country, almost unknown till his time; and the anonymous writer is so evidently a master of his subject, that it is possible he may be familiar with instances unknown to me of the admission of foreigners into Hindu castes. Unless this be the case, however, I am obliged to differ from the opinion advanced, and can only show my estimation of those who mention it, by assigning my reasons at length.

If the supposition be, that the whole Hindu people sprang from the same root with the Scythians, before those nations had assumed their distinctive peculiarities, I shall not conceive myself called on to discuss the question; but, if such a union is said to have taken place within the historic period. I shall be inclined to doubt the fact. The admission of strangers into any of the twice-born classes was a thing never contemplated by Manu, and could not have taken place within the period to which the records of his time extended. No trace of the alleged amalgamation remained in Alexander's time; for though he and his followers visited India after having spent two years in Scythia, they discovered no resemblance between any parts of those nations. The union must therefore have taken place within a century or two before our era, or at some later period. This is the supposition on which Col. Tod has gone in some places, though in others, he mentions Scythian immigrations in the 6th century before Christ and others at more remote periods.

That there were Scythian irruptions into India before those of the Moghuls under Chengiz Khan, is so probable, that the slightest evidence would induce us to believe them

to have occurred; and we may be satisfied with the proofs afforded us that the Scythians, after conquering Bactria, brought part of India under their dominion; but the admission of a body of foreigners into the proudest of the Hindu classes, and that after the line had been as completely drawn as it was in the Code of Manu, is so difficult to imagine, that the most direct and clear proofs are necessary to substantiate it. Now, what are the proofs—

1. That four of the Rájput tribes have a fable about their descent, from which, if all Hindu fables had a meaning, we might deduce that they came from the West, and that they did not know their real origin.

2. That some of the Rájputs certainly did not come from the west of the Indus.

3. That the religion and manners of the Rájputs resemble those of the Scythians.

4. That the names of some of the Rájput tribes are Scythian.

5. That there were, by ancient authorities, Indo-Scythians on the Lower Indus in the second century.

6. That there were white Huns in Upper India in the time of Cosmas Indico-Pleustes (6th century).

7. That De Guignes mentions, on Chinese authorities, the conquest of the country on the Indus by a body of Yue-chi or Getae, and that there are still Jits on both sides of that river.

1 The first of these arguments is not given as conclusive; and it is obvious that native tribes, as well as foreign, might be ignorant of their pedigree, or might wish to improve it by a fable, even if known. The scene of the fable carries us no nearer to Scythia than Abu, in the north of Guzerat; and few, if any, of the tribes which Col. Tod describes as Scythians belong to the *four* to whom only it applies.

2. The great tribe of Yadu, which is the principal, perhaps the only one, which came from beyond the Indus, is the tribe of Crishna, and of the purest Hindu descent. There is a story of their having crossed to the west of the Indus after the death of Crishna. One division (the Sama) certainly came from the West in the seventh or eighth century, but they were Hindus before they crossed the Indus, and many of those who still remain on the West, though now Mahometans, are allowed to be of Hindu descent. Alexander found two bodies of Indians west

of the Indus, one in Paropamisus, and one near the sea, and though both were small and unconnected, yet the last mentioned alone is sufficient to account for all the immigrations of Rájputs into India, without supposing aid from Scythia.

3. If the religion and manners of any of the Rájputs resemble those of the Scythians, they incomparably more closely resemble those of the Hindus. Their language also is Hindu without a Scythian word (as far as has yet been ascertained). I have not heard of any part of their religion, either, that is not purely Hindu. In fact all the points in which they are said to resemble the Scythians are common to all the Rájputs without exception, and most of them to the whole Hindu race. On the other hand, the points selected as specimens of Scythian manners are for the most part common to all rude nations. Many, indeed, are expressly brought forward as Scandinavian or German, although an identity of manners between those nations and the eastern Scythians is still to be proved, even supposing their common origin.

If, instead of searching for minute points of resemblance, we compare the general character of the two nations, it is impossible to imagine any two things less alike.

The Scythian is short, square built, and sinewy, with a broad face, high cheek-bones, and long, narrow eyes, the outer angles of which point upwards. His home is a tent; his occupation pasturage; his food flesh, cheese, and other productions of his flocks; his dress is of skins or wool; his habits are active, hardy, roving, and restless. The Rájput, again, is tall, comely, loosely-built, and when not excited, languid and lazy. He is lodged in a house, and clad in thin showy fluttering garments; he lives on grain, and is devoted to the possession of land, never moves but from necessity; and though often in or near the desert, he never engages in the care of flocks and herds, which is left to inferior classes.

4. Resemblances of name, unless numerous and supported by other circumstances, are the very lowest sort of evidence; yet in this case we have hardly even them. Except Jit, which will be adverted to, the strongest resemblance is in the name of a now obscure tribe called Hún to that of the horde which the Romans called Huns; or to that of the great nation of the Turks, once called by the Chinese Hienyan or Hiong-nou.

The Húns, though now almost extinct, were once of some consequence, being mentioned in some ancient inscriptions; but there is nothing besides their name to connect them either with the Huns or the Hiong-nou. It might seem an argument against the Hindu origin of the Rájputs, that the names of few of their tribes are explainable in Sanskrit. But are they explainable in any Tartar language? and are all names confessedly Hindu capable of explanation?

5. We may admit, without hesitation, that there were Scythians on the Indus in the second century, but it is not apparent how this advances us a single step towards their transformation into Rájputs; there have long been Persians and Afghans and English in India, but none of them have found a place among the native tribes.

6. Cosmas, a mere mariner, was not likely to be accurate in information about the upper part of India; and the white Huns (according to De Guignes) were Turks, whose capital was Organj, or Khiva; it does not seem improbable, therefore, that he confounded the Getae with the Huns, but his evidence, even if taken literally, only goes to prove that the name of Hun was known in Upper India; and along with that it proves that up to the sixth century the people who bore it had not merged in the Rájputs.

7. The account of De Guignes has every appearance of truth. It not only explains the origin of the Scythians on the Indus, but shows us what became of them, and affords the best proof that they were not swallowed up in any of the Hindu classes. The people called the Yue-Chi by the Chinese, Jits by the Tartars, and Getes or Getae by some of our writers, were a considerable nation in the centre of Tartary as late as the time of Tamerlane. In the second century before Christ they were driven from their original seats on the borders of China by the Hiong-nou, with whom they had always been in enmity.

About 126 B.C. a division of them conquered Khorasan in Persia, and about the same time the Sú, another tribe, whom they had dislodged in an early part of their advance, took Bactria from the Greeks. In the first year of the Christian era, the Yue-Chi came from some of their conquests in Persia into the country on the Indus, which is correctly described by the Chinese historians. This portion of them is represented to have settled there, and accordingly, when Tamerlane (who was accustomed to fight the Jits in Tartary) arrived at the Indus, he recognised his old antagonists in

their distant colony. They still bear the name of Jits or Jats, and are still numerous on both sides of the Indus, forming the peasantry of the Punjab, the Rájput country, Sind, and the east of Belochistan; and, in most places, professing the Musalman religion.

The only objection that has been brought forward to the Getic origin of the Jats is, that they are included in some lists of the Rájput tribes, and so enrolled among pure Hindus; but Col. Tod, from whom we learn the fact, destroys the effect of it by stating that, though their name is in the list, they are never considered as Rájputs, and that no Rájput would intermarry with them. In another place, he observes that (except for one very ambiguous rite) they were 'utter aliens to the Hindu theocracy,' and he himself maintains that they are descended from the Getae. Their language, however, if it proves to be unmixed Hindu, will furnish a strong, though not insuperable objection.

It is a more natural way of connecting the immigration of Rájputs from the West with the invasion of the Getae, to suppose that part of the tribes who are recorded to have crossed the Indus at an early period, and who probably were those found in the South by Alexander, were dislodged by the irruption from Scythia, and driven back to their ancient seat to join their brethren, from whom, in religion and caste, they had never separated.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the Jats may be of Scythian descent, but that the Rájputs are all pure Hindus."[1]

1. Elphinstone's History of India, edited by Prof. E. B. Cowell, 1874, Appendix II., p. 250.

APPENDIX B.

PROFESSOR GARBE ON "THE INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE KSHATRIYAS."

35

APPENDIX B.

PROFESSOR GARBE ON "THE INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE KSHATRIYAS."

"We see, it is the most consistent Monism that is here taught in the Upanishads. To have been the first in the world to proclaim this is a service that can scarcely be overestimated. But whether the merit of this belongs to the Brahmans, or is ascribed to them incorrectly, that is the question which is to be answered in the following paragraphs.

To begin with, be it observed that the closer circle of specialists, Weber, Max Müller, Deussen, Regnaud, Bhandarkar and others, have for some time been pointing out evidence which suggests that another portion of the Indian people were the dominant factor in the development of the monistic doctrine in the elder Upanishads. But so far as I know the subject has not been presented to the general educated public in a popularly intelligible form.

In the second book of the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, from which I have already quoted two specimens, occurs the following narrative, of which another and only slightly different version is preserved in the fourth book of the Kaushitaki Upanishad:—

The proud and learned Brahman Balaki Gargya comes on his wanderings to Ajataçatru, Prince of Benares, and says to him: 'I will declare to you the Brahm.' The king is rejoiced, and promises to reward him for it handsomely, with a thousand cows. And now the Brahman begins to deliver his wisdom: 'I worship the spirit (*i. e.*, the power) in the sun as Brahm;' but he is interrupted by the King, who tells him he already knows that and needs not to be told of it. Then the Brahman speaks of the spirit in the moon, in the lightning, in the ether, in the wind, in fire, water, and the regions of earth,; but the King rejects all this as being already familar to him. And whatever else Gargya presents, it is nothing new to the King. Then, the story goes, the Brahman was dumb. But Ajataçatru

asked him: 'Is that all?' and Gargya answered: 'Yes, that is all.'

Then the King exclaimed: 'These trifles do not amount to knowing the Brahm,' whereupon Gargya declares that he will become a disciple of the King and learn of him. And Ajataçatru replies: 'It is contrary to the natural order that a Brahman receive instruction from a warrior and expect the latter to declare the Brahm to him; however, I will teach you to know it.' Then the King took the Brahman by the hand and led him to where a man lay asleep. The King spoke to him; but he did not arise. But when Ajataçatru touched him with his hand, he rose. Now the King asked the Brahman: 'Where was this man's mind, consisting as it does of knowledge, while he was asleep, and whence has it just returned?' But Gargya could make no reply. Then Ajataçatru explained to him, how the mind, or the self, of the sleeper roves in the dream, how all places belong to him, and he can be at will now a great king, now a great Brahman; but how there is then a still higher and happier state, namely, when one has fallen into a dreamless sleep, and no longer has any consciousness of anything. This is the condition in which the self of man, unaffected by the world of phenomena, rests in its true nature, in which there is no difference between the Ataman and the Brahm.

More significant perhaps than this story is another which is reported both in the fifth book of the Chandogya Upanishad, and in the sixth book of the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad:—

The young Brahman Cvetaketu comes to an assembly, and is there asked by the Prince Pravahana Jaivali: 'Young man, has your father instructed you?' 'Yes, sir.' 'Do you know, then,' the Prince goes on, 'whither creatures go from here when they die? Do you know how they return hither?' And three other questions he addresses to the Brahman youth, who is obliged to confess in confusion that he knows nothing of all these things. And so Cvetaketu returns dejected to his father, who here appears under the name of Gautama, and reproaches him: 'Although you have not instructed me, you told me that you had. A simple King has addressed five questions to me, and I was unable to answer a single one.' Thereupon the father answers: 'My son, you know me well enough to know that I have told you all I know. Come, let us both go and

become disciples of the Prince.' The Prince receives the old Brahman with all honour, and permits him to ask for a gift. But Gautama refuses all earthly possessions, gold, cows, and horses, female slaves and robes, and desires of the Prince the answers to the questions which had been addressed to his son, saying: 'I come as a disciple of the revered one.' Pravahana is at first disposed to put him off, but finally consents to fulfil the wish of the Brahman, and says that no one in the world outside of the warrior caste can explain these matters. And the following words are also significant: 'I would that neither you, O Gautama, nor any of your ancestors had part in that sin against us because of which this knowledge has until now never set up its residence among Brahmans. To you I will reveal it; for who could refuse one who makes such an appeal?' And thereupon the King imparts to the Brahman all he knows.

The same story in all essentials is found in the beginning of the Kaushitaki Upanishad, save that the Prince has a different name, to wit, Chitra.

Passing over evidence of less importance, I will only give in condensed form the contents of the eleventh and following chapters from the fifth book of the Chandogya Upanishad, where again a man of the warrior caste, Açvapati, Prince of the Kekaya, appears in possession of the highest wisdom. The book tells us that a number of very learned Brahmans, referred to by name, are meditating on the question: 'What is our Self? What is the Brahm?' And they decided to go to Uddalaka Aruni, of whom they knew that he was at the time investigating the 'Omnipresent Self.' But he said to himself: 'They will question me, and I shall not be able to answer all their questions,' and therefore he invited his visitors to go with him to Açvapati, Prince of the Kekayas, to request instruction from him. The King receives the visitors with honour, invites them to tarry with him, and promises them presents equal in amount to the sacrificial fees. But they said: 'A man must communicate what he is occupied with. You are at present investigating the Omnipresent Self. Reveal it to us.' The King replied: 'I will answer you to-morrow morning. And the next forenoon, without having accepted them as disciples, *i.e.*, without going through the formalities customary on such an occasion, he asked them one after the other: 'As what do you revere the Self?' And the Brahmans made answer one after another: 'As the sky,

as the sun, as the ether, as water, as earth.' Then the King calls attention to the fact that they are all in error, because they regard the Omnipresent Self as a single thing, existing by itself; whereas in truth it is the Infinite,—at once the infinitely small and the infinitely great.

The significance of these stories is evident. Whether real occurrences underlie the separate accounts, or whether they are to be regarded as legendary deposits of a conviction widely current at the time, cannot be determined; moreover, the question of the historical basis of the stories is of no importance for us. The fact that such tales are contained in genuinely Brahman writings which are regarded in India, and rightly so, as mainstays of Brahmanism, speaks to us in a language not to be misunderstood. It shows that the authors of the elder Upanishads did not try, or did not dare, to veil the situation that was patent in their time, and claim the monistic doctrine of the Brahm-Atman as an inheritance of their caste; perhaps, even, that they did not consider the establishment of this doctrine as a service of such far-reaching importance as to care to claim it for the Brahman caste. In later times, it is true, this philosophy became in the fullest sense the property of the Brahmans, and has been cultivated by them for twenty-five centuries, down to the present day, so that it is still regarded as the orthodox doctrine of Brahmanism. But this does not alter the fact that it took its rise in the ranks of the warrior caste. To this caste belongs the credit of clearly recognising the hollowness of the sacrificial system and the absurdity of its symbolism, and, by opening a new world of ideas, of effecting the great revolution in the intellectual life of ancient India. When we see how the Brahmans, even after they had adopted the new doctrine, continued to cultivate the whole ceremonial system—the great milch cow of the priestly caste—and how they combined in unnatural fashion these two heterogeneous elements by representing a stage of works (ceremonials) as the indispensable pre-requisites to the stage of knowledge, we are warranted in the assumption that these things developed in ancient India just as they did in the rest of the world. Intellectual enlightenment is opposed by its natural enemy, the priesthood, until it has become too strong in the people to be successfully opposed any longer. Then the priest, too, professes the new ideas, and tries to harmonise them as far as possible with his hollow shams.

But the ideas thus far treated, which are the ones most eminently characteristic of Indian wisdom, are not the only contribution by the Indian warrior caste to the thought and religion of their race. The best known of all Indians, the noble Gautama of Kapilavastu, who founded Buddhism about five hundred years before Christ, was also a Kshatriya,—according to later tradition, and formerly the only one known to us, the son of a king; but according to older sources now revealed to us chiefly through Oldenberg's meritorious labours, the son of a wealthy landholder. Buddha, "the Enlightened"—let us speak of him by this honourable title familiar to all the world—opposed most energetically the whole sacrificial system and all the prejudices of Brahmanism. The ceremonies and the priestly lore were in his eyes a cheat and a fraud, and the caste system of no force; for he taught that the highest good was just as accessible to the humblest as to the Brahman and the king; that every one without distinction of birth could attain to saving knowledge by renunciation of the world, by self-conquest, and by sacrifice of self for the good of one's fellow-creatures."

* * * * * * * *

Only one other community founded in that time has, as above intimated, endured to the present day, that of the Jains, which has numerous members, especially in Western India. The doctrines of the Jains are so extraordinarily like those of the Buddhists that the Jains were until recently regarded as a Buddhist sect; but in fact we have to do with another religion, founded by a predecessor of Buddha named Vardhamana Jñâtaputra—or in the language of the people, Vaddhamana Nâtaputra—in the very same region where Buddhism arose. The only essential difference between the doctrines of the two men consists in the fact that Vardhamana laid great stress upon castigation, while Buddha, the deeper mind of the two, declared this to be not only useless but absolutely harmful. But the point I wish to make here is that the founder of the religion of the Jains, one that occupies a conspicuous position in the history of Indian religion and civilisation, sprang also from the warrior caste.

An entirely different character from the doctrines hitherto discussed is borne by another product of Indian intellectual life which comes within the sphere of our consideration,—a product known to most of my readers not even by name probably, yet presenting in content and development

the most important problems in the history of religion: the doctrine of the Bhagavatas or Pancharatras. By these names, the first being the older and original, a sect of Northern India designated itself, the existence of which is verified for the fourth century before Christ, but which in all probability reaches back into earlier pre-Buddhist times. The Bhagavatas professed a popular monotheism independent of ancient Brahman tradition, and worshipped the divinity under various names: Bhagavat 'the Sublime'—from which word their own designation is derived—Narayana, 'Son of Man,' Purushottama, 'the Supreme Being,' but chiefly as Krishna Vasudeva, *i.e.*, Son of Vasudeva. This worship bore such a character that out of it was developed a feeling quite identical with the Christian feeling of believing love and devotion to God. The Indian word for this feeling is 'bhakti' and for the one filled with the feeling, 'bhakta.'"

* * * * * * *

The founder of this religion was Krishna Vasudeva, who though later raised to the rank of a god, or better, identified with God, was, as his name and the legends attached to it indicated, a member of the warrior caste. As early as in the Mahabharata, the great Indian national epic, Brahmanism had appropriated the person and doctrine of Krishna and made of the deified hero a form of the god Vishnu. Thus in this case also Brahmanism managed to renew its own vitality by appropriating an originally un-Brahmanic element.

So we have seen that neither the profound Monism of the Upanishads, nor the highly moral religions of the Buddhists and the Jains, nor, finally, the faith of the Bhagavatas, founded in pure devotion to God, was originated in the Indian priestly caste. However favourably one may judge of the achievements accomplished by the Brahmans during the course of time in the most varied fields of knowledge—and I myself would be far from wishing to belittle their services—this much at least is established, that the greatest intellectual performances, or rather almost all the performances of significance for mankind, in India, have been achieved by men of the warrior caste." [1]

[1] Prof. R. Garbe's "Philosophy of Ancient India," pp. 73—80., and pp. 82, 83, 85.

PART II.

THE KHATRIS.

PART II.

THE KHATRIS.

1.—'KHATRI' AND 'KSHATRIYA.'

The Khatris, a comparatively small mercantile and trading caste in the Punjab, have recently proclaimed to the world with an undue assumption of superiority that they are the true descendants of the ancient Kshatriyas; and they have, in some instances, with more warmth than discrimination, even "denied that the present-day Rajputs have any claim at all to be twice-born."[1] But in thus allowing their zeal to outrun their discretion the Khatris have only made it easier for the Rajputs to disprove their pretensions.

One of the chief arguments put forward by the Khatris in support of their claim to be considered Kshatriyas, is the resemblance between the words Khatri and Kshatriya; and their assertions, supported by references to various authorities, have, in some quarters at least, produced an erroneous impression. The circumstance that has lent an air of plausibility to their arguments is the fact that the term Khatri, besides being the designation of the trading caste of the Punjab, is also a variant of the name Chhatri or Kshatriya. To any one who has studied, or even merely read, all that has been written on the question at issue between the Khatris and the Kshatriyas, it will be apparent that the most noticeable fact in the whole controversy is the confusion arising from this dual signification of the

1. Census Report, 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh, p. 222.

term Khatri. This circumstance by itself would, at first sight, appear to be a cogent argument in favour of the Khatris' claim, but from the evidence that will be cited in the following pages it will be obvious even to the most casual reader that such is very far from being the case.

In Fallon's Hindustani Dictionary we find the following clear distinction drawn between 'Khatri,' the variant of Chhatri or Kshatriya, and 'Khatri' the name of the Punjabi caste:—

"Chhatri, Khattri, n. m; (S. क्षत्रिय) the second or military caste of the Hindus."

"Khattri, n. m; Khatrani, n. f. (S. क्षात्री) a Punjabi baniya or grocer."[2]

It will be noticed that Chhatri, with its variant Khatri, is derived from the Sanskrit Kshatriya; whereas Khatri, in the sense of "a Punjabi baniya," is derived from the Sanskrit Kshattri (क्षात्री), which denotes a woman of the Kshatriya caste—a derivation which clearly points to the mixed origin of the Khatris (*vide* p. 52). One of the words is given only in the masculine form, while the feminine of the other is also given.

H. M.'s Privy Council.

There is a decision of H. M.'s Privy Council among the cases on appeal from the East Indies which has the unique distinction of having been referred to by both parties in this controversy in support of their respective contentions. The Khatris have been trading on the credulity of the unsuspecting public by quoting just so much of the decision as is sufficient to mislead the unwary; and condescendingly add "that the Rajputs, too, come from the ancient Kshatriya family and are as good Kshatriyas as the Khatris themselves."[3] The portion

---

2. Fallon's Hindustani Dictionary. pp. 557,964.
3. "The Khatris, their origin, traditions, and social status," p. 10.

of the decision dealing with the four castes is, even at the risk of being tedious, reproduced below *in extenso* :—

"It is undoubted that there were originally four classes: First, the Brahmans; second, the *Khatris*; third, the Vaishyas; fourth, the Soodras; the first three were the regenerate or twice-born classes, the latter the servile class. It was contended on the part of the appellant, that the *Khatri* and Vaishya classes have ceased to exist, and were sunk into the Soodra class, and that there are now two classes only, namely, the Brahman and the Soodra. The appellant, in order to show that the proper genuine *Khatri* are extinct, cites as authorities in support of this position *The Ayeen Akbery, or, the Institutes of the Emperor Akbar, Vol. II, p.* 377, in which there is this passage: 'At present there are scarcely any true *Kehterees* to be found, excepting a few who do not follow the profession of arms.' 'Those among them who are soldiers are called Rajpoots.' *Tod's Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Vol. I, p.* 53, where it is said, 'Of the fifth dynasty of eight princes four were of pure blood, when Kistra, by a Soodra woman, succeeded.' *Ward's Account of the Hindus, Vol. I, p.* 66 (*edit.* 1815) *sec* 2, which treats of the *Kshutryas* caste, has this passage:—'Some affirm, that there are now no *Kshutryas* in the Kuleeyogu, that only two castes exist, Brahmans and Sudras, the second and third orders having sunk in the fourth.' *Steele's Summary of the Law and Customs of the Hindu Castes, p.* 95, says, 'The Brahmuns assert that Purseram destroyed the whole of the *Kshutriyus*;' and at p. 96: 'The Rajpoots, Maratha Chiefs of the Sattara or Bhonsle, and Kolapoor families, etc., and other houses, lay claim to the title of *Kshutriy*, and wear the Jenwa. But they are considered Soodras by the Brahmuns;' and there is an opinion to the like effect expressed by Mr. Sterling, in a

paper on *Orissa Proper, in Vol. V of the Asiatic Researches, p.* 195 : 'The proper genuine *Khatris* are, I believe, considered to be extinct, and those who represent them are, by the learned, held only to be Soodras.'

"Whatever weight may be due to these authorities in support of a speculative opinion, entertained, perhaps, by learned Brahmins and others, *their Lordships have, nevertheless, no doubt that the existence of the Khatri class, as one of the regenerate tribes, is fully recognized throughout India, and also that Rajpoots in Central India, and in this District, are considered to be of that class.* No doubt, as far as we are aware, has ever been raised in the Courts in India as to the existence of the *Khatri* class as one of the regenerate tribes. The Courts in all cases assume that the four great classes remain. Thus Sir W. Macnaghten, in his marginal note to *Pershad Singh* v. *Ranee Muhesree* (3 *Sud. Dew Rep* 132), says, 'According to the Hindu law, an illegitimate son of a Rajpoot or any of the three superior tribes, by a woman of the Sudra or other inferior class, is entitled to maintenance only.' In the statement of the case, he takes it as an admitted fact that a Rajpoot is one of the three superior tribes, although, it is true, as has been observed, that the point ultimately decided in this case was only that the paternity was not established. In the second volume of Macnaghten's *Principles of Hindu Law, p.* 119, the marginal note is, 'The illegitimate son of a person belonging to one of the regenerate tribes (in this case, a Rajpoot) is entitled to maintenance only.' Accurate information as to the distinction of classes, especially in this part of India, is to be found in the statistical survey of Dr. Francis Buchanan, conducted under the direction of the Government of India. The second volume of *M. Martin's India* contains Dr.

Buchanan's report on the District of Goruckpoor, and at p. 456 he says, '*The Rajpoots are here, everywhere, and by all ranks, admitted to be Khatris,* although they claim all manner of descents, except from the persons who, according to the Vedas, sprang from the arms of Brahma.' Other passages in the same report have been referred to by Mr. Leith to the same effect. The Rajpoots are mentioned in Elphinstone's *History of India, Vol. I, p.* 607, as the military class in the original Hindoo system ; so also in Cunningham's *History of the Sikhs, p.* 202. Thornton, in his *Gazetteer, tit. Rajpootana,* says, 'The widely spread sect of Rajpoots are considered offsets of the Kshetriyas, one of the four great castes into which the Hindoos were originally divided.' *Sir John Malcolm, in his Memoir of Central India, Vol. II, p.* 125, enters fully into the state and condition of the Rajpoot tribes. They are treated of throughout his history as belonging to the superior class ; he mentions that although their intercourse with females of a lower tribe may have, in some instances, produced a mixed race, yet even in this class, which he terms the bastard Rajput tribes, the lowest of them who aspire to Rajpoot descent consider themselves far above the Soodras.

"In the report of Dr. Buchanan, mention is made of the existence of this mixed race in the District of Goruckpoor, and that there are several persons of the mountain tribe, *called Khatris,* who are a spurious race, but who claim all the dignities of the military order. One of the witnesses in this case, the Rajah of Gopalpore, a *Khatri Kossuck* (Kausik) states that his family do not intermarry with the mountain rajahs. *It seems to us, therefore, not only that the Khatri class must be considered as subsisting, but that according to the Hindoo law generally prevailing in this part of India,* and independently of exceptions arising out of any well-established usage or custom to the

contrary, as to particular places or families, *Rajpoots are to be considered as of the Khatri class*[4]"

The high authority of Prof. Cowell[5] is scarcely necessary to show that the words "*Khatri*," "*Kehteree*," and "*Kshutriy*" are all used in the above extract in the sense of the generic term Kshatriya, and not in the sense of the comparatively small trading caste found in the Punjab. The Khatris have, therefore, only stultified themselves in putting forward this Privy Council decision in their favour. Both parties to this suit, the appellant as well as the respondent, were Kshatriyas or Rajputs, and the Punjabi Khatris had not the remotest concern with the case. Moreover, the family of the Raja of Gopalpur in the Gorakhpur District, which belongs to the Kausik clan of Kshatriyas, is still in existence. The town of Gopalpur, from which the family takes its title, was founded by Rajah Gopal Chandra. "The Gorakhpur Branch (of Kausiks) hold a respectable rank, and intermarry with the Chandrabansi, Surajbansi, Baghel, Sirnet, and Chauhan clans."[6]

THE AIN-I-AKBARI.

A quotation or two from the 'Ain-i-Akbari' of Abul Fazl has also been called in to bear witness on behalf of the Khatris' claim to be considered Kshatriyas; but, as will be shown below, the 'Ain-i-Akbari' takes us no further than the decision of H. M.'s Privy Council—it merely uses the word Khatri as a variant of Kshatriya, and makes no allusion whatever to the trading caste of the Punjab.

It should, in the first place, be remarked that the 'Ain-i-Akbari' is scarcely to be looked upon as

4. "Moore's Indian Appeals," Vol. VII, Choutarya Run Murdan Syn *vs.* Sahub Purhulad Syn, 1857, pp. 45—48.

5. Tagore Law Lectures, 1870, p. 173.

6. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh," Vol. III, p. 183.

an authority on disputed questions of Hindu caste; we have the opinion of Sir William Jones "that a man who knows Hindus only from Persian books, does not know the Hindus......................From the just severity of this censure I except neither Abul Fazl nor his brother Faizi."[7] This encyclopædic work *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, which contains "details from the revenues of a province to the cost of a pine-apple, and from the organisation of an army and the grades and duties of the nobility to the shape of a candlestick, and the price of a curry comb,"[8] devotes about six pages, out of more than a thousand, to the elucidation of the subject of Hindu castes—the "Languages of Hindustan" being allowed as many lines only! It is impossible to gather from the 'Ain-i-Akbari' the most elementary information about castes; *e.g.*, the difference between the Bhuinhar and the Teli, or the Kahar and the Dom.

The following passages from the 'Ain-i-Akbari,' bearing on the names "Khatri," and "Rajput," are taken from the two existing English versions, and are placed in juxtaposition for convenience of reference:—

GLADWIN	JARRETT
"The Hindu philosophers divide the human race into Charburren or four tribes.	"The Hindu philosophers reckon four states of auspiciousness, which they term varna
1. Brahmin.	1. Brahmana.
2. Chuttree, vulgarly Kehteree.	2. Kshatriya, vulgarly Khatri.
3. Wiess, vulgarly Biess.	3. Vaishya, vulgarly Bais.
4. Shooder, vulgarly Sooder.	4. Sudra, vulgarly Sudra.
The other people of the world they call Milleetch.	Other than these are termed Mlechcha.

7. Col. Jarett's "Ain-i-Akbari," Vol. III, Preface, p. 2.
8. *Ibid*. Vol. II, Prefa e, p. 5.

GLADWIN

At the creation of the world, these four tribes were produced from Brahma. The Brahmins from his mouth, the Kehteree from his arms, &c. . . . .

The Brahmins—these have properly six duties. ....The Kehteree are enjoined the performance of three of the abovementioned duties. . . .

The Kehteree (Kshatriya) were of two original tribes.

First Soorujbaunsee, who are regarded as descendants of the sun. . . .

The second tribe of Kehteree are called Soombunsee or descendants of the moon. . . . . .

There are now upwards of 500 different tribes of Kehteree, 52 of whom are in esteem, and 12 are better than the rest.

But at present there are hardly any true Kehterees to be found, excepting a few who do not follow the profession of arms.

Those among them who are soldiers, are called Rajpoots. There are near a thousand different tribes of Rajpoots; but I shall only mention the most famous

JARRETT

At the creation of the world, the first of these classes was produced from the mouth of Brahma, the second from his arms, &c.

. . . .

The Brahmans have six recognised duties... ....of these six the Kshatriya must perform three. . . . .

The Kshatriya form two races, the Surajbansi (Solar dynasty) and the Somabansi (Lunar dynasty).

The first mentioned are descendants of the sun. .

The second race is descended from the moon.

. . . .

There are more than 500 tribes of the Kshatriyas, of whom 52 are pre-eminently distinguished and 12 are of considerable importance.

At the present day, no trace of the true Kshatriya exists. Some of their descendants, abandoning the profession of arms, have taken to other occupations, and this class is known to the world by this name.

Another body of them adopting the sword as their calling are designated Rajputs, and are divided into thousands of septs. I record the names of a few of the

GLADWIN	JARRETT
who are entertained in His Majesty's service:—	most renowned, that are now in His Majesty's service:—
The Rahtor. . . .	The Rahtor. . . .
The Chowhen. . . .	The Chauhan. . . .
The Punwar. . . .	The Panwar. . . .
The Jadown. . . .	The Jadon, . . .
The Bhatee. . . .	The Bhati. . . .
The Jareeyah. . . .	The Jarejah. . . .
The Gehlote. . . .	The Gehlot. . . .
The Seesowdyeh. . .	The Sesodia. . . .
The Chundrawut . .	The Chandrawat . . .
The Cutchwaheh. . .	The Kachhwahah . . .
The Soolunkhee. . .	The Solankhi. . . .
The Toonoor. . . .	The Parihara. . . .
The Birjoojir. . . .	The Tonwar. . . .
	The Badjugar. . . .
And each of these tribes now carry in their hands genealogical tables for ages back."[9]	Each of these tribes claims an ancestry traced back to hundreds of thousands of years, a source of splendid pride to the intelligent judgment and is indeed a theme far above the level of an idle tale to distract the mind."[10]

The names *Kshatriya, Chuttree, Kehteree,* and *Khatri,* in the above passages, obviously designate the military and dominant caste of the Hindus; and the same terms are used to designate them throughout the 'Ain-i-Akbari,' *viz.*, in the description of the "mixed" castes; and in the portions which deal with Karma-Vipaka, or the ripening of actions, *i. e.*, the good and evil consequences in this life of human acts performed in previous births; Vyava hara, or the administration of justice; the periods of religious life; dress; fasts; sins; marriage; and the ceremonies to be performed at death.

9. Gladwin's "Ain-i-Akbari," 1783, Vol. II, p. 81, *et seq.*
10. Jarrett's "Ain-i-Akbari," 1894, Vol. III, p. 114, *et seq.*

The italicised portion, which also appears in the Privy Council decision quoted above, is triumphantly pointed out by the Khatris of the Punjab to prove their superiority over the Rajputs ; but even in this passage trade is not specified as the occupation or profession of the so-called " true Kshatriyas " of those days. The Khatris, by their own showing, in the time of Akbar, had more or less the monopoly of dalali or the profession of brokers, and if this section of the Hindu community were the only real representatives of the ancient military caste of India, no historian in an account of the Hindu caste system would have contented himself with giving them a mere passing allusion. Abul Fazl himself complained "that he found his Hindu informants . . . immeshed in their own opinions, conceding the attainment of truth to no other, while artfully insinuating their own views."[11] It would therefore be a justifiable conjecture to suppose that the inclusion of the sentences italicised is to be attributed to Raja Todar Mal, the author's Khatri colleague, whom Abul Fazl had in all probability consulted on the subject, and who had seized the golden opportunity of "artfully insinuating" what he, perhaps, could not have honestly declared in more explicit terms—for, be it remembered, that Raja Todar Mal had, in religious matters, "a narrow and sectarian mind."

In his descriptions of the territorial divisions and subdivisions of the Mogul Empire Abul Fazl mentions over a hundred caste names of the people inhabiting or predominating in each locality. About forty of the clan-names of the Rajputs (including the terms "Surajbansi Rajputs" and "Somvansi Rajputs") appear in these lists, but the name 'Khatri' (as denoting a Punjabi caste) is nowhere to be found—not even in the districts of Delhi, Rawalpindi, or Lahore, nor yet in any portion

---

11 Jarrett's "Ain-i-Akbari," Vol. III, Preface, p. 1.

of the Bari Doab which is their recognized home.[12] Incidentally, however, the name Khatri occurs in that of a shrine in Peshawar called "Kor-Khatri,"[13] or the "Baniya's House" according to General Cunningham, who mentions another "Katri Kor" or "Grain Merchant's House" in the Ranighat Hill, north of Ohind.[14] The mercantile signification of the term would therefore appear to have been preserved, like the fly in amber, in these historical place names.

Other References.

Among other writers the following may also be quoted to show that the term Khatri was commonly used to designate the Kshatriya caste in language that admits of no uncertainty or doubt.

In Chand Bardai's "Prithi Raj Raisa" are found the lines :

दुज षित्रौ वैस सूद्र बरन
तजै न कछि तक्कत नयन ॥[15]

Sir John Malcolm, in a note on the word "Rajpoot," thus explains the term:—"Rajpoot, literally son of a Raja or Prince, is the generic name for one of the first and most numerous classes who are called Khetri or the military, and form the second of the four castes into which the Hindus are divided.[16]"

Prof. H. H. Wilson in his well-known Glossary says that "Khatri" (Khetree, Khetry) is Hindi for the Sanskrit 'Kshatriya', and implies "a man of the second pure tribe, the soldier and the sovereign caste.[17]"

In Stocqueler's "Handbook of India" the castes are thus enumerated :—"The Hindus are separated

12. Jarrett's "Ain-i-Akbari," Vol. II, pp. 153—371.
13. *Ibid.* Vol. II, p. 404.
14. Cunningham's "Ancient Geography of India," pp 76 and 81.
15. "Prithi Raj Raisa."
16. Sir John Malcolm's "Memoir of Central India," 1823. Vol. I, p. 23. note.
17. Prof H H. Wilson's "Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms." p. 284.

into four great castes or religious divisions—Brahmins, Kataries or Rajpoots, Bhyses, and Soudras." [18]

Platts' Dictionary gives the following: "Khatri (Sanskrit Kshatriya) the second (the military and regal) caste of the Hindus." [19]

The statement of Farishta that Raja Bharat and King Vikramaditya were "Khatris," and the lists of "Khatri" Kings given in the "Ain-i-Akbari" and the "Seir-ul-Mutakhrin," can only be rendered intelligible in the light of the above-mentioned signification of the term "Khatri:" to explain the statement of these Persian writers on any other hypothesis would be a mere travesty of history.

It may, moreover, be remarked that even if it be taken for granted that the 'Khatri' Kings mentioned in these Persian lists were of the Punjabi mercantile caste, the fact would not help their cause in the least. The "Ain-i-Akbari" also gives lists of thirty-five or forty Kayastha Kings, and it is a matter of history that there were in former times Sudra dynasties and Sudra kingdoms; at the present day, too, some of the inferior castes are represented among the Native Chiefs and Princes of India. There is a passage in Manu's Code which forbids the twice-born to associate with a Sudra, "even though he were a king." [20]

2.—Origin of the Khatris.

Rev. Sherring, unable to satisfactorily account for the Khatris, looks upon their origin as an "ethnological puzzle. [21]" But the Khatri question is not peculiar in this respect. "The origin of the various Hindu castes and sub-castes is involved

---

18. Stocqueler's "Handbook of India," 1845, p. 35.
19. Platts' 'Hindustani Dictionary," 1884, p. 870.
20. Z. A. Ragozin's "Vedic India." p. 284.
21. "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. I., Pt. III, Chap. IV, p. 277.

in much mystery and embedded in countless myths."[22] Of the thousand and one caste names to be found in India, how many are there of which a satisfactory explanation can be given, and of how many might it not be said that the story has been invented to fit the name—*ex nomine fabula* ?

There are, however, three caste names, similar in sound and almost indentical in construction with the word Khatri, to which the name, as the distinctive appellation of the trading caste of the Punjab, might be traced ; *viz* : (1) (क्षात्रि) Kshatri, (2) (क्षात्रिः) Kshatrih, and (3) (षट्त्री) Khattri.

(1) Kshatri—a class of mixed orgin, mentioned in the Institutes of Manu.[23] Haughton renders the Sloka into English, thus:—"From a Sudra, by a woman of the commercial, military, and priestly classes, are born sons of a mixed breed, called Ayogava, Cshattri, and Chandala, the lowest of mortals."

(2) The word (क्षात्रिः), Kshatrih, is found in Panini's "Ashta-Dhiai,"[24] and it means the son of a Kshatriya by a woman of another caste.[25]

(3) In the "Tashrih-ul-Aqvam" it is stated that originally the word Khatri was *Khat* + *tri*, which means the person ordained to perform six duties ; three belonging to Kshatriyas on his father's side, and three belonging to Vaisyas on his mother's side. The passage is as follows :—

کهت بمعني شش وتري بمعني پروردن است از اختيار شش کرم
سه کرم چهتري يکے دان يعني خيرات دادن دوم خگ کردن سوم عام
هندو شاستر خواندن و سه کرم بيش يکے زراعت کنانيدن دوم مادهٔ گاوان
پروردن وفروختن و سوم دادوستد نمودن - باين اسم مسمى گرويدند •

Translatian:—'*Khat*' means six, and '*tri*' means to cherish, or to keep. By taking up six duties—three

22. "Calcutta Review," Vol. CXVI, Jan. 1903, p. 63.
23. "Manu, "X. 12.
24. "Ashta Dhiai," Bk. IV., Chap. 138.
25. Apte's "Sanskrit Dictionary, " p. 436.

those of a Chhattree, *viz* :—(1) to give alms; (2) to perform "*Jag*;" and (3) to acquire the knowledge of the Hindu Shastras; and three duties of a Baishya; *viz* :—(1) Agriculture; (2) to keep and sell cows; and (3) money-lending; (they) are called by this name (Khattri).

The existence of these three words detracts considerably from the force of the arguments based on the resemblance of the two words 'Khatri' and "Kshatriya"—"a resemblance which, in the opinion of Mr. Risley, is wholly accidental. A mere resemblance of name, however, unsupported by other circumstances, is of little or no value: in the following pages further evidence will be found in support of the theory that the derivation of the word "Khatri," as denoting a caste in the Punjab, must be traced either to (क्षात्र) Kshatri of Manu, Kshatrih (क्षात्रिः) of the "Ashta-Dhiai" of Panini, or to (खट्री) Khattri of the "Tashrih-ul-Aqvam."

The alleged identification of the modern Khatris with the "Khatriaioi." of the Greeks is dealt with separately in a note (Appendix B., p. 69).

But while the Khatris have assiduously laboured to point out the etymological connection between the words 'Khatri' and 'Kshatriya,' they have scarcely even attempted to account for a far more important fact, *viz.*, the use of the word Khatri as denoting a distinct and separate caste from the 'Chhatris', who have been shown (*vide* Part I), and are acknowledged to be, the descendants of the ancient Kshatriyas. This distinctive use of the term has hardly even been disputed and never been explained. It is curious that the Khatris never consulted, on this point, the Pandits among the Saraswat Brahmans (their purohits), nor the learned Pandits of Kashmir, which, like Benares and Nadia, has long been a home for Sanskrit scholars, and where some of the members of the Khatri community are said to have held high

positions: at least there is no record of their ever having done so. This apparent apathy and want of curiosity on the part of the Khatris can only be explained by supposing that there exist sufficient, and perhaps indisputable, grounds for their acquiescing in the use of the term 'Khatri' in contradistinction to the term 'Chhatri.'

It might, however, be urged that the Puranic legend of Parasuram was generally believed, that it sufficiently explains the origin of the Khatris, and that it also throws some light on the fact why these people came to be called Khatris instead of Chhatris. But this legend is not in point, because it clearly states that those Kshatriyas who were spared by Parasuram were the descendants of Suryabansi, Chandrabansi, and Agnicula Kshatriyas. The Khatris have loudly proclaimed that all the Rajputs are of Scythian origin, and they have specially pointed out the Agniculas as of pure Scythian blood; this legend, therefore, instead of proving the Khatri to be pure Kshatriyas, mixes them up with the races whom they call Scythian.

Historically speaking, the legend involves an anachronism. P rasuram was the contemporary of Ram, the hero of the Ramayana; and according to the Mahabharat, he also fought with Bhishma: both these epic poems were written long before the spread of Buddhism in India. The legend of the Agniculas, however, refers either to the Buddhist period or to the period of the so-called revival of Brahmanism. It is therefore impossible to place any reliance on this legend. It is a mere nursery tale, and Wheeler in his "History of India" pays not the slightest heed to it. He says: "The Kshatriyas were never extirpated." "Those professing Buddhism were defeated and perhaps driven out of India; but the Kshatriyas or Rajas are to this day dwelling as a people in their own country of Raj-

putana."[26] Colonel Tod, citing internal evidence, calls the legend 'ridiculous'.[27]

But there is a tradition which points to the mixed origin of the Khatris, as accepted by Mr. Nesfield. The Census Report of 1865 says:—'Khuttree (subsidiary)—The Thakurs on one occasion, which occurred some thousands of years ago, had been defeated in a fight with their adversaries. Their women, to avoid the indignity of falling into the hands of their conquerors, took refuge among the Brahmans of the Saraswat tribe, with whom they cohabited afterwards; and the issue of their connection with them were called by the distinct name of Khattree in contradistinction to Chhuttree (Thakurs)."[28] This is more reasonable, and this may probably be the original tradition, incorporated in the Puranas with some embellishment; and the close connection of the Khatris with the Saraswat Brahmans may be taken as corroborative evidence of the truth of the above tradition.

There are certain other traditions of a similar nature which go to show that the Khatris are of Vaisya extraction. The Census Report of 1865 says:—"Khatris are descended from a Rajput father by a woman of the Vaisya caste."

The "Tashrih-ul-Aqvam" (تشریح الاقوام), a work in Persian written in 1825, and presented by the author to Sir John Malcolm, gives the origin of several sub-castes. In the preface (دیباچه) the author points out that he has collected the material for the book from two sources—(1) from the book of Hindu Shaster (ازروی کتب های هندو شاشتر); (2) from the testimony of the elders of each class (اظهار مردم ثقاه هر فریق). About

26. Wheeler's "History of India," Vol. II, p. 65.
27. Tod's "Rajasthan," Vol. I, p. 27.
28. Census Report, 1865, Appendix B., p. 38.

the origin of the Khatris, the author says that they are descended from Chhatris and Vaishyas.

احوال قوم کهتّری که سرآمد ایشان بامتزاج چهتّري و بیش است •

The Khatris have descended from Bubutswa, an illegitimate son of Dhatrashtra, begotton of a Vaishya woman.

ابتدای قوم کهتّري از راجه دهرت راشتّر که زن بیش به نکاح آورد پسر
او بوبو تسو که از شکم زن قوم بیش ولادت یافته به بیش چهتّري که بزبان
بهاکها کهت تري و در لهجه بها کها کهتّري است موسوم گشت و اولاد اوهمین
نا یافت •

The author of the "Imad-ul-Sadat", a book written in the year 1807, is in favour of the theory that the Khatris are Chhatris; but its whole argument is based on the fact that the Saraswat Brahmans eat food cooked by Khatris. It is a matter of importance, however, to remember that the Khatris come from the Punjab, where the rules as to eating are not so strict as they are in the United Provinces. People in the Punjab eat food cooked by Kahars. The fact of the Saraswat Brahmans taking food from the Khatris cannot therefore be accepted as a proof of the Khatris' direct descent from the ancient Kshatriyas. Further, it is certain that all the Saraswats do not eat food cooked by Khatris; those who do so are looked down upon by other Saraswats, and there is no social intercourse between these two sections of the Saraswat community.

The "Tashrih-ul-Aqvam," written only 18 years after the "Imad-ul-Sadat," says:—

وبرهمن سارست که طعام خانه کهتّریان مي خورند حقیقتش اینست
که اصل سارست که بر دهرم خود قایم اندنمي خورندو آنانکه به طمع پروهت
شدن که موجب حصول منفعت های دنیا هست خوردن اختیار کردند
و منتر کایتري ایشان و کهتّریان یکسان است و اصل سارستان اینها
شریک آب وتان نمي سازند وقیما بین شان عقد نسبت نمي بندند و زنار
زامنتر کایتري ایشان جدا است •

Translation:—"And as for the Saraswat Brahmans eating food of the Khatris' house (cooked by the Khatris). The truth of the matter is that the genuine Saraswats who stand by their *dharm* do not take (such food). And those who, owing to their greed for becoming purohits, which is a means of securing worldly gain, do indulge in (it), have their sacred thread and 'gayatri mantra' identical with those of the Khatris. And the genuine Saraswats do not let them join in bread and water (eating and drinking), and permit no marriage alliances with them and have their sacred thread and 'gayatri mantra' quite distinct."

This clearly indicates that only a section of the Saraswats eats with the Khatris, and they are in consequence cut off from the rest of their community. The Mantra Gaitri and the sacred thread of the Khatris are the same as those of the Saraswats who eat with them; but the other Saraswats who have no connection with the Khatris have the Janeu and Gaitri like other Brahmans. The Meerut Khatris also admit that "only the Purohits and Padhas from among the Saraswat Brahmans eat such food."[29] In this connection it may be mentioned that there is a section of the Saraswats who practise widow marriage.[30]

The Khatris say:—"We are so much accustomed to the modern state of things that some persons seem to think that only those should be called Kshatriyas who can trace their origin to some great luminary in the political firmament of Aryavarta."[31] Not only in India, but all the world over, the status of a family is judged by the length of its pedigree; but the author of the pamphlet evidently places no faith in such criteria because the Khatris, unlike the Rajputs, are unable to trace their origin to any

29. "Answers to Inquires about Khatris,' p. 7.
30. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P. and Oudh," Vol. III, p. 290.
31. "An Account of the Khatris," by Harnam Das Varma, Pt. I. ch. 1, p 8

well-known Kshatriya. The Brahmans, the priestly caste, trace their origin to some Rishi; and if the Kshatriyas were not able to show that they are the offspring of some recognized Kshatriya, they could not claim to be one of the twice-born castes. No ancient Kshatriya Gotras, such as Raghubansi, Yadubansi, Gautam, etc., are found among the Khatris. Their Gotras correspond with those of their purohits, which shows that they are borrowed ones. Had the Khatris been the descendants of the ancient Kshatriyas they would at least have retained the old Gotras.

Mr. Risley has the following on the origin of the Khatris:—"It seems to me that the internal organization of the caste furnishes almost conclusive proof that they are descended from neither Brahmans nor Kshatriyas, and that the theory connecting them with the latter tribe rests upon no firmer foundation than a resemblance of name, which for all we know may be wholly accidental. . . . . If then it is at all necessary to connect the Khatris with the ancient four-fold system of castes, the only group to which we can affiliate them is the Vaisyas."[32]

Pandit Jogendra Nath Bhattacharya, M.A.,D.L., President of the College of Pandits, Nadia, says of the Khatris:—"Some authorities take them to be the same as the bastard caste Kshatri, spoken of by Manu as the offspring of a Sudra father by a Kshatriya mother. The people of this country include the Kshettris (Khatris) among the Baniya castes, and do not admit that they have the same position as the military Rajputs. The Kshettris themselves claim to be Kshatriyas, and observe the religious rites and duties prescribed by the Shastras for the military castes. But the majority of them live either by trade or by service as clerks and accountants, and their caste status ought, it seems, to be intermediate between that of the

---

32. "Tribes and Castes of Bengal," 1891, Chapter on Khatris.

Rajputs, on the one hand, and the Baniyas and the Kayasthas on the other."[33]

Dr. Hunter strangely contradicts himself on this question. In the "Imperial Gazetteer" he alludes to the founder of the Burdwan Raj Family, the acknowledged head of the Khatri community, as a Kshatriya; while in another volume of the same work he says:—"In the Punjab are found the Khatris, who have perhaps the best title of any to regard themselves as descendants of the original Vaishyas!"[34]

3.—The Occupation of the Khatris.

As to their present occupation, the Khatris put forward various, and even conflicting, accounts of the circumstances under which they came to adopt trade as their profession. "They explain their following the occupation of trading by a story that when Parasuram was engaged in massacring the Kshatriyas, some Kshatriya children took refuge with a Saraswat Brahman. Parasuram heard of this, and came to the Brahman's house to kill them, but was persuaded to spare them on condition they would adopt trade as their profession."[35]

An explanation of a more modern date is referred to by one Kasi Nath, of Sirsa, Allahabad, in a letter to the "Indian Antiquary." This writer, who gives no authority whatever for his statements, says in effect that the Emperor Aurangzeb on his return to Delhi from the Conquest of Bijapur and Golconda (1686—88) dismissed all Khatris from the Imperial Service for refusing to carry out his mandate about having the widows of their caste remarried; and subsequently appeased them by conferring on them "the sole privilege and monopoly of dalali or profes-

33. "Hindu Castes and Sects." p. 138.
34. "Imperial Gazetteer," Vol. , p. 423 and Vol. VI, p. 502.
35 "Census Report, 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh," Pt. I, p. 221.

sion of broker,"[36] since which time the profession has been confined to the Khatris. Mindful, however, of their own interpretation of a passage in the "Ain-i-Akbari," one of the recent Khatri pamphlets points out that "the occurrence took place in the reign of Alla-ud-din Khilji (1295—1315), for at the time of Akbar (1556—1605) the Khatri community had already relinquished the duties of soldiership;"[37] but the writer of the pamphlet also omits to cite any authority for his statement.

From such accounts it is a relief to turn to Mr. Risley's common-sense conjecture that the Khatris are traders because they are of Vaishya origin; and this view also "gets us out of the difficulty which led Sir George Campbell to propound the doubtful theory that, in the ordinary course of history, the warlike conquerors of one age become the astute money-lenders of another."[38]

As regards the occupation of the Khatris, the "Imad-ul-Sadat" says:—

لیکن چون ریاست براجپوته رسید کهتّري براى تحصیل معاش جابجا
دوید بعضی عمل بیش اختیار کردند یعني دوکانداري پیشه شان شد و بعضی
تقلید شودر یعني خدمتگاري وبعضی سپاه گري وبعضی تسوید وتحریر وسیاق
وسباق را یاد گرفتند •

In the above quotations the words بعضی تقلید شود یعني خدمتگاري (some of them in imitation of the Sudras took to menial service) show that the Khatris even stooped so low as to adopt menial service like the Sudras. That, however, may have been in former times, but at the present day there are among them Brokers, Tabibas, Attars, Purchunias, Bazazes, Bisatis, and Clerks.

It is maintained that Manu allows a Kshatriya to adopt the profession of a Vaishya in times of dis-

---

36. "Indian Antiquary," 1873, Vol. II, p. 27.
37. "Khatris, Their Origin, Traditions, &c." p. 14, footnote
38. "Tribes and Castes of Bengal," Chap. on Khatris

tress. But they are strictly prohibited from selling liquids of any sort, red cloth, woollen cloth, prints, roots and medicinal plants, perfumes, clarified butter, dressed grain, honey, wax, sugar, etc.[39] The Khatris cannot deny that several of their community are engaged as Gandhis in selling perfumes, and many of them are Attars who sell medicinal plants, poisons, roots, etc. They are also retail cloth-merchants, and Purchunias who sell grain dressed with salt. It is not a little curious to find the sellers of pulses and salt (*dál* and *nún*) taunting the Rajputs who are engaged in agriculture as allowed by Manu in times of distress.[40]

"In Behar," says Dr. Buchanan, "one-half of the Khatris are goldsmiths." In Mysore there is a caste of weavers called Khatris; there are also Khatri weavers in Gujerat.[41] Mr. Kitts says:—"The Khatris are traders in the Punjab, and silk-weavers, when we find them in Bombay."[42] The Census Report of 1891 classifies as weavers the Khatris of Berar, Baroda, Bombay, and Hyderabad. The Punjabi Khatris, however, make no mention whatever of their Guzerathi brethren, who in 1891 numbered nearly 67,000;[43] nor is any explanation to be found as to how they took to the occupation of weaving.

4.—Some Khatri Customs.

It is said that among the Khatris the adoption of a sister's son is allowable. This is apparently a rule which is not found among the Dwijatis, and is not sanctioned by any of the Hindu laws of adoption.

---

39. "Manu," Chap. X.86—88.
40. *Ibid.* Chap. X. 95.
41 Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. I. p. 282 Vol II p. 197, Vol. III, p. 157.
42. 'Compendium of the Castes and Tribes found in India," Introd., p. IX.
43. "Census of India," 1891. Vol. II., Table XVII, Part B.

The Kshatriyas are never allowed to accept 'dán' in any case, not even in times of distress. (आपद्.) But the Khatris accept 'dán' in the Punjab; all the 'charawa' of the 'Granth Sahib' goes into the pockets of the Khatris who call themselves priests.

As for the Sanskars of which they boast so much, it may be said that the Upanayana is, with them, a mere farce. Boys are never sent to the Gurkul, but on the second day they either go to their fathers' shops and sell commodities, or engage themselves in selling coins and other things: so that it cannot be said that the Upanáyana is observed among the Khatris according to the Sutras of Manu.

They have, moreover, a peculiar custom among them. When an old man dies all the members of the deceased's family put on masks, sing and play, and sometimes indulge in obscene songs. The custom is termed "Hansa tamasa." The Saraswats also share this custom with the Khatris, the origin of which is quite unknown. No religious sanction can be claimed for it. Khatris and their purohits are the only classes that practise it. The Garud Puran, which is the authority on the funeral ceremonies among orthodox Hindus, is silent on the point. The Sutras Smritis do not sanction it, and it is certain that no trace of it is to be found among the ancient Aryans.

5.—The Khatris in the Census of 1901.

In the Census Report for the N.-W. P. and Oudh, 1901, the Census Superintendent says—"Public opinion here is not unanimous in classing the Khattris with Rajputs, Thakurs, and Chhatris. . . . . The greater number of the district committees would place Khattris in the fourth group . . . . . . *I have followed the ruling of the Census Commissioner* and place them

in the third group . . . . It should, however, be noted that the Rajputs of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh deny even the remotest connection, and many, if not most, Agarwalas consider themselves superior to the Khattris."[44]

The Census Commissioner in his Report for All India, just published, has the following remarks on the caste status of the Khattris :—"A meeting of protest was held at Bareilly, and a great array of authorities was marshalled to prove that the Khattris are lineally descended from the Kshatriyas of Hindu mythology" . . . . "The *evidence* laid before me . . . . . seemed to make it clear that in British India, at any rate, they are *generally believed* to be the modern representatives of the Kshatriyas of Hindu tradition. For census purposes the fact that *most people* do hold this belief was sufficient in itself, and it would have been *irrelevant* to inquire into the grounds upon which the opinion was based. Superintendents of Census were accordingly *instructed* to include the Khatris under the heading Kshatriya in their classification of castes. The decision gave *general satisfaction* and served to illustrate the practical working of the principle that the sole test of social precedence prescribed was *native public opinion,* and that this test was to be applied with *due consideration* for the susceptibilities of the persons concerned."[45]

The above passage calls for a few words of comment. In 1881 the Khatris were classed by Sir Denzil Ibbetson among "*Traders,*" "immediately *after* the Aroras of the Punjab, ten places *lower* than the Agarwals, and several places *below* the Kandus and Kasarwanis of the United Provinces, and the Subarnabaniks of Bengal."[46] In Bengal in 1891 they were classed with the Banyias or Vaishyas;

44. "Census Report," 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh, Pt. I, pp. 221, 222.
45. "Census of India," 1901, Vol. I, p. 539.
46. *Ibid.*

and about the same year Mr. Risley himself, in his "Tribes and Castes of Bengal," was of opinion that they were a purely mercantile or trading caste. In the Census Report for 1901, however, Mr. Risley calls them *Kshatriyas* and places them immediately *above* the Agarwals and ten places *higher* than the Aroras of the Punjab, eight places *above* the Kandus of the United Provinces, and about fifteen places *above* the Subarnabaniks of Bengal. And yet it is stated, in all seriousness, that it would be "irrelevant" to enquire into the grounds for the present apotheosis of the Khatris!

As regards "native public opinion" in the very province where the "protest meeting" was held, the Census Superintendent expressly declares that the Khatris are *not* considered Kshatriyas by the people of the United Provinces. In the Punjab Report, where one would naturally look for information about the caste status of a distinctly Punjabi caste like the Khatris, there is no mention whatever of the people of the Punjab (two millions of whom are Rajputs, acquiescing in the classification of the half million Khattris as Kshatriyas. The Census Superintendent is, strangely enough, silent on the point.

A perusal of the various Census Reports for 1901 only leads one to the conclusion that the Khatris are Kshatriyas merely "BY ORDER" of the Census Commissioner.

APPENDIX C.

NOTE ON THE "KHATRIAIOI" OF THE GREEKS.

APPENDIX C.

NOTE ON THE "KHATRIAIOI" OF THE GREEKS

The mention of the Khatriaioi by Ptolemy in his "Treatise on Geography" has been put forward by the modern Khatris in support of their ancient origin. In a paper on the Khatris the following quotation occurs:—"According to Greek writers the people that held the territory comprised between Hydrastes (Ravi) and the Hyphasis (Biyas) were the Khatriaioi, whose capital was Sangal."—(M'Crindle); and the writer adds:—"Evidently the name Khatriaioi refers to the Khatris who according to Ptolemy, on which authority Mr. M'Crindle writes the note quoted above, were the rulers of the territories between the Ravi and Biyas rivers, the original home of this race. Some writers identify the modern Khatris with the Xathri who according to Greek historians occupied trans-Indus regions at the time of Alexander's invasion." [1] It is somewhat amusing to find the Khatris, on the one hand, identifying themselves with the Khatriaioi mentioned by Ptolemy in the second century after Christ; and on the other, contending that "the word Khatri came into use in the sixth century of the Christian era, if not still later". [2] The Khatris would have us believe that Ptolemy mentions them in the second century A.D. by the Greek form of a name which was not in existence in his day, and which did not actually come into use till a few hundred years later."

Regarding the Khatriaioi of Ptolemy, the passage in M'Crindle is as follows;—"According to Greek writers the people that held the territory comprised between the Hydrastes (Ravi) and the Hyphasis (Biyas) were the "Kathaia," whose capital was Singala. . . . . The name is still found spread over an immense area in the N.-W. of India, from the Hindu

---

1. "Khatris, their Origin, Traditions, and Social Status," p. 6.

2. "An account of the Khatris, &c.," by Harnam Das Varma, Pt II, pp. 3 , 36. A writer in the "Indian Antiquary," 1873, Vol. II, p. 27, says—"The name Khatri occurs in Indian History since the time of Baber," *i.e.*, 1494—1530 AD.

Kush as far as Bengal, and from Nepal to Gujarat, under forms slightly variant." [3]

M'Crindle has other references also to the same people. In his "Invasion of India," 1893, he says:—"The Kathaians are described by ancient authors as one of the most powerful nations of India. Their very name indicates their warlike propensities and predominance, for if it is not indentical with that of the military caste Kshatriya, it is at least a modified form of that word." [4]

In a still later work, published in 1901, M'Crindle, in a note to Strabo on Kathaia and the Kathaians, has the following: It thus appears that Kathaia must have been situated to the east of that river (Ravi) and may probably have been nearly if not altogether co-extensive with what is now called the district of Amritsar . . . . The Kathaians were not ruled by kings like the tribes which lay near the Indus, but were autonomous, each of the communities into which they were divided being self-governed. In point of martial skill and prowess they were superior to all their neighbours. Their very name indeed indicates their warlike propensities and predominance, for it is doubtless a modified form of Kshatriya, the designation of the military caste."[5] Duncker says: "Alexander defeated the Khattias (the Kathaioi of the Greeks) at their chief city Cakala (Sangala), the modern Amritsar." [6]

Professor H. H. Wilson thus identifies some of the Indian races mentioned by the ancient writers: "It is a singular geographical arrangement, that places the same people on the Hydaspes, at Modura or Muttra, and in the Vindhya Mountains: the Caspirei of Ptolemy seem to be the same as the Catheri of Diodorus, and the Cather of Arrian, who were allied with the Malli and Oxydracæ or people of Multan and Cutch, against Alexander, or in a word the Cshatriyas or Rajputs of Western India. Hence perhaps the error he has committed in assigning such remote places to the same state, for in the Punjab and Doab, the various cities he specifies, were no doubt governed by Cshatriya or Rajput princes, although they were not subjected to one common sway, nor constituted the territory of any one peculiar tribe." [7]

---

3. M'Crindle's "Ancient India by Ptolemy.," p. 157.
4. *Ibid.* 'Invasion of India by Alexandar the Great." App. note 4, p. 347.
5. *Ibid.* "Ancient India," p. 37, note 1.
6. "History of Antiquity," Vol. IV, p. 401.
7. "Asiatic Researches,' Vol. XV, p. 119.

From the above-quoted authorities it is tolerably clear that the Kathaians (Kathaioi of the Greeks) were, under various modifications of the name, none other than the ancient Kshatriyas, the military and dominant caste of India ; and there is nothing to warrant the inference that the various names by which they are mentioned indicate any racial or caste distinctions. Professor H. H. Wilson remarks as follows on the names used by the ancients :—" The confusion arising from an inaccurate mode of writing or reading names prevailed as much among ancient as modern writers, and in classical authors much unnecessary perplexity has been occasioned . . . . They seem indeed to have gathered scattered notices of places and nations from different sources, perhaps tolerably accurate, but which were distorted and confounded in the hands of the writers themselves."[8] The name Khatriaios, *pl.* Khatriaioi, may therefore be merely one of the many Greek renderings or corruptions of 'Kshatriya.'

On the other hand, the only mention by M'Crindle of a separate and distinct tribe or caste called Khatri is the following :—The name of the Cetriboni would seem to be a transcript of Ketrivani (for Kshatrivaneya). They may therefore have been a branch of the Kshatri (Khatri), one of the impure tribes of the list of Manu (l. X. 12)."[9]

---

8. "Asiatic Researches," Vol. XV, p. 106.
9. M'Crindle's "Ancient India," Megasthenes and Arrian, p. 143, note.

PART III.

THE KAYASTHAS.

PART III.

THE KAYASTHAS.

I.—The Rajput and Kayastha Contrasted.

A brief description of the general characteristics of the Kayasthas and Kshatriyas respectively will not be an inappropriate preliminary to the consideration of the claims of the writer caste to the rank and status of the military order.

The Rajputs, who at the present day represent the Kshatriyas of old, are strong in body and stout of heart; and have from time immemorial been noted for their martial spirit and chivalrous instincts—nay. their very names are indicative of valour and bravery. The dawn of history reveals them to us as the dominant and military race of India, and they are not unmindful of their "illustrious and regal descent." The Rajputs are devoted to the profession of arms and the possession of land; at the present day they are largely represented in the native army, they constitute the bulk of the landed aristocracy of the United Provinces, and are the Ruling Chiefs of Rajputana; and Rajput families of note are found among the ruling and titular chiefs of every province in British India. The Kayasthas, on the other hand, are physically weak and lacking in courage; they are, in consequence, totally unfit for the life of a soldier, and have never been admitted into the native army. "They have few prejudices and no pride of caste." They are possessed, however, of great intelligence and a peculiar aptitude for clerkly and literary pursuits. From the earliest times they have been 'men of the pen,' and are to be found everywhere as clerks and accountants. In Bengal, they swell the ranks of the Services and are to be found

---

1. Sir John Malcolm's "Memoir of Central India," Vol. II, p 166.

among doctors, lawyers, journalists, &c.; some of them have even risen to eminence in the service of Government and in the literary and learned professions. It may therefore be confidently asserted that there is not a single point of similarity between these two castes ; and even when found in association with each other in ordinary life, the Rajput usually stands to the Kayastha, *ceteris paribus*, in the relation of the employer to the employed.

2.—History of the Kayasthas.

British Period.

The present respectable and influential position of the Kayasthas is of comparatively recent date. The facilities afforded under British rule for the education of the people, the large pen-and-ink establishments inseparble from the system of a centralized administration, and the admission of the natives of the country to the higher ranks of the Government services, have each and all contributed to the making of the Kayasthas of the present day. "Perhaps no race in India has so eagerly responded to the attempts which have been made to civilize, in the European fashion, the natives of the country."[2]

Mahomedan Period.

But the Kayasthas had already under the Mahomedan régime ceased to be mere clerks and accountants. The twice-born classes, especially the Brahmans, who had formerly occupied the higher posts in the country, refrained from the study of Persian and Arabic ; but the Kayasthas eagerly seized the opportunity of advancing their own interests—they applied themselves to the study of these languages and mixed freely with their Moslem rulers "In the parts of Hindustan where the Mogul system

---

2. Elliot's "Races of the N.-W. P.," Vol. I., pt. I., p, 180.

was fully introduced, the use of the Persian language has thrown public business into the hands of Mussulmans and Cayets."[3] Hence we find that, during the decline and fall of the Mogul Empire, the Kayasthas had in some instances held offices of importance and distinction

Hindu Period.

During the Hindu period, however, the Kayasthas were never admitted to any of the higher offices in the administration of the country; not a single instance is to be found in the ancient semi-historical books, such as the "Ramayana" or "the Mahabharat," of a Kayastha holding the appointment of Minister to a Raja--this exalted position having been invariably held by a twice-born, who alone could instruct a Raja in the science of Raj Nitya. But, on the contrary, the Kayasthas were always found in the low position of scribes and accountants. As far as can be ascertained from the ancient writings, the inferior work of a scribe or village accountant was exclusively set apart for the Kayasthas; hence it is that most of the patwaris in the United Provinces and in Behar are of this caste. In the Deccan the post of a patwari is considered so very low, that none but a low-caste Sudra will accept it. "It is a known fact that under the ancient village system as laid down by Manu, the patwari was one of the twelve menials or village servants, and that he was classed along with the barber, washerman, watchman, carpenter, potter, and the like."[4]

For a general delineation of the un-Kshatriya-like character of the Kayasthas, the reader is referred to Pandit Kalhana's "Raj Tarangini" or the "Chronicles of the Kings of Kashmir,"[5] as well as to Kali Dás' drama, entitled "Mirch-Kataka."

---

3. Elphinstone's "History of India," ed. by Prof. Cowell, p. 59.
4. "Bulandshar Memoirs."
5. Kalhana's "Raj Tarangini," V. 180, VII. 149. VIII. 89, 90. 107, 114.

3.—Their Origin, Character and Caste Status.

The Kayasthas are by caste pure Sudras; but they claim to be Kshatriyas, and quote as evidence the questionable mythological narratives found in the Puranas. It is curious enough to find two such widely dissimilar castes as the Khatris and the Kayasthas both claiming descent from those Kshatriyas who "somehow or other escaped the cruel sword of Parasuram;" but when a number of inferior castes, such as Gujars, Bhils, Telis, and even Chamars, have the same tradition concerning their origin, the claim ceases to be distinctive and the tradition loses all significance A detailed critical examination of the Puranic evidence would be merely a work of supererogation, as among the Hindus themselves the Puranas carry no weight as against the Smritis, which in respect of caste distinctions are always accepted as authoritative and conclusive. There are in all eighteen authoritative Smritis, but none of them recognises the Kayasthas as Kshatriyas; while, on the other hand, three of these Smritis, *viz.*, Yagnavalkya, Ushna, and Vyas, describe the Kayasthas as pure Sudras, or at least persons of no pretensions to high birth and engaged in inferior pursuits for their livelihood.

The interpretation placed by Calucca Bhat on Manu--the first of the twenty Dharma Shastras, which rank next in authority to the Vedas--shows that the Kayasthas are Sudras; so also does the Mitakshara. The United Provinces, Behar, the Punjab, and Ajmere-Merwara are governed by the law of the Mitakshara School—which law is nothing more than the commentaries upon the Institutes of Yagnavalkya—and it is considered an authority upon almost all disputed points amongst the Hindus.

The character and low origin of the Kayasthas as given by the Hindu Lawgivers and others is as follows:—

Yagnavalkya says :—

चाटतस्करदुर्वृत्तमहासाहसिकादिभिः ।
पीड्यमानाः प्रजारक्षेत् कायस्थैश्च विशेषतः ॥

"The King should protect his subjects from the oppression of pick-pockets, thieves, malefactors, and unscrupulous persons, and more so from the Kayasthas."[6]

Ushna says :—

वैश्यायां विप्रतश्चौरात कुम्भकारः स उच्यते ।
कुलालवृत्त्या जीवेत नापिता वा भवन्त्यतः ॥
सूतके प्रेतके वापि दीक्षाकालेऽथ वापनम् ।
नाभेरूर्ध्वं तु वपनं तस्मान्नापित उच्यते ॥
कायस्थ इति जीवेत्तु विचरेच्च इतस्ततः ।

"The offspring of an illicit connection of a Brahman with a Vaishya woman is called kumbhakar (potter), and his means of subsistence is by making earthen pots, or by following the profession of a barber, who lives by shaving on the occasions of births or deaths, or in connection with the performance of Vedic rites; as they shave the parts above the navel they are called "Napits;" further they may adopt the mode of life of Kayasthas who roam about and live by their wits."

The assertion of the Kayasthas that the derivation of their name shows their origin "from the body of Brahma," falls to the ground when the following from the Ushna Smriti is taken into consideration:—

काकाल्लौल्यं यमात्क्रौर्यं स्थपते रथ कृन्तनं ।
आद्याक्षराणि संगृह्य कायस्थ इति कीर्तितः ॥

"The word Kayastha consists of three letters, each of which signifies a particular trait of his char-

6. Yagnavalkya, Achara Dhiai, Sloka 40.

acter, and which carries in itself a meaning of its own: *viz* :— का from काक (crow), signifies restlessness ; य from यम (Pluto), denotes cruelty ; स्थ from स्थपति (wood-cutter), means desire for personal gain at the cost of others. These several qualities when combined represent, *in toto*, the character of the Kayastha." [7]

The Vyas Smriti has the following :—

ब्राह्मण्यां शूद्रजनितश्चाण्डालस्त्रिविधः स्मृतः ।
वर्धकी नापितो गोप आशापः कुम्भकारकः ॥
वणिक् किरात कायस्थ मालाकार कुटुम्बिनः ।
वरटोमेदचाण्डाल दास श्वपच कोलकाः ॥
एतेऽन्त्यजाः समाख्याता येचान्येचगवाशनाः ।
एषांसंभाषणात्स्नानं दर्शनादर्कवीक्षणम् ॥

"By a Brahman mother and a Sudra father are born three kinds of Chandals. They are carpenters, barbers, Ahirs, Chamars, potters (kumbhakars); Banjaras, Kiratas, Kayasthas, Malis, Basphors, Siarmars (those who follow the profession of killing jackals); Chandals, Bari, Sweepers, and Kols. These are called people of low caste, as well as those who eat beef. One should bathe after talking with them ; and the purification prescribed for looking at them is to gaze at the sun."[8]

"Suryadhwaja—There is a more scandalous derivation of the name and origin of this sub-caste, which is particularly irritating to the Kayasthas and need not be repeated."[9].

The "Sabda Kalpadrama," the "Sudra Kamalákar," and the "Jatimala," all speak of the Káyasthas in unmistakeable terms as Sudras. The first-named

7. "Ushna Smriti," Chap. VIII, Slokas 32—35.
8. "Vyas Smriti." Chap. I., Slokas 10—12
9. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes," Vol. III, p. 191.

work has a world-wide reputation and was compiled by the late Rajah Sir Radha Kant Deb Bahadur, K. C. S. I., an enlightened Kayastha of Bengal ; the second was the work of the renowned Bhatta Kamalakar about 300 years ago. It is a treatise compiled especially for the use of the Sudras, and no pandit of the present day would dare to act against it. The descendants of the author are still held in great veneration, and in all assemblies of pandits in Benares they are invariably honoured in a special manner.

In the "Vyawastha Durpan," or Digest of Hindu Law, by Shama Charan Sarkar, the Kayasthas are classed as Sudras.[10]

Among the twelve sub-divisions of the Kayasthas there are two named "Ambastha" and "Karan." According to the explanations given to these two terms by Manu they are of the Varanshankar class and origin. :—[11]

Karan—"Sons begotten by twice-born men of women of the class next immediately below them, wise legislators call similar, not the same, in class with their parents, because they are degraded to a middle rank between both, by the lowness of their mothers ; they are named in order :—Murdhbheshicta, Maheshya, and Karan or Kayastha ; and their several employments are teaching military exercises ; music ; astronomy and keeping herds, and attendance on princes."[12]

Ambastha—"As the Ambastha and Ugra, born in direct order, with one class between those of their parents, are considered as low, so are the Cshattre, and the Vaideha born in an inverse order with one intermediate class ; and all four may be touched without impurity."[13]

---

10. Shama Charan Sarkar's "Vyawastha Durpan," 1857, pp 1032. 1036
11. "Manu," X. 6. 13.
12. Haughton's Translation. Ed. 1825. Vol. II., pp. 340, 341.
13. *Ibid.* Vol. II., p. 342.

Yagnavalkya is of the same opinion: Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt has summarised his conclusions thus:—

" Father.	Mother.	Caste formed
Brahman.	Vaisya.	Ambastha.
Vaisya.	Sudra.	Karan."[14]

" The Kayasthas rank next to the Vaidyas, and are the leaders of the classes accounted Sudras. They are otherwise called the writer caste, and are, both in profession and practice, penmen "[15].

Throughout the ancient writings a Kshatriya is invariably distinguished by his noble and chivalrous qualities : he is never depicted as low or base ; but the above extracts show clearly enough the origin and character of the class who would fain claim kinship with the "high-born, pure-blooded, royal Rajput tribes."[16].

In the Hindu Shastras the Kayasthas are invariably mentioned as scribes, nay, their great progenitor, Chitra Gupta, is said to have been born with a pen and ink-pot. This circumstance, coupled with the fact that the art of writing was not known in India till a comparatively late age, affords some ground for the theory that the art of writing was introduced into India by an ancestor of the race subsequent to the advent of the Kshatriyas into the country—they cannot therefore claim to have sprung from the same stock as the Kshatriyas.

History relates that the Kayasthas, who accompanied the Brahmans from Kanauj to Bengal, were menial servants ; and the Gulam Kayasthas of Eastern Bengal take up domestic service—a form of occupation restricted to the Sudras pure and simple. Of the Kayasthas in other parts of India we find that the Kolitas of Chota Nagpur and Assam, the Parbhus in the Bombay Presidency, the Kannakans and

14. R. C. Dutt's " Ancient India," Vol., III . p. 3c9
15. "Calcutta Review," Vol XV. Jan, 1851, p. 62.
16. Sherring's " Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. III , p 181.

Shambhogs in Mysore, the Karnams of the Madras Presidency, and the Vellalars, the Vedugas, the Mudaliars, and the Pillays in the other parts of the Deccan, all belong to the Sudra caste.[17]

Prior to the agitation of reform among the Kayasthas they claimed for themselves a fifth Varna, or caste, over and above the four generally accepted ones. This fifth caste would therefore be "up-Sudra, *i.e.*, a step lower than the Sudras; but when they discovered that Manu did not sanction a fifth Varna, they began to style themselves Kshatriyas. In Rajputana the Kayasthas are still called Panchalis," *i.e.* "belonging to the fifth order."

4.—Some Caste Peculiarities.

Some of the caste peculiarities of the Kayasthas, as opposed to those of the Kshatriyas, will now be noticed.

The Kshatriyas are enjoined by the Shastras to protect the lives and persons of others; they are nowhere in the Shastras enjoined to keep accounts. The Kayasthas assert that as the Kshatriyas are required to use the sword, so the Kayasthas are to use the pen: but this is not supported by any authority from the Shastras.

The sub-divisions of the Kayastha caste are all endogamous, whereas among the Kshatriyas the clans are exogamous; as to intermarriage, the Kayasthas never have, nor ever have had, any marriage connection whatever with the recognized Kshatriyas.

The Kayasthas have stated that, with a few exceptions, all the marriage ceremonies performed by them are exactly the same as those among the Kshatriyas; they, however, fail to realize that were

17. Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. II, p. 181, Vol. III, p 120, and Jogendra Nath Bhattacharya's "Hindu Castes and Sects," pp. 192, 194, 197

it not for these "few exceptions" the marriage ceremonies of all Hindu castes would be almost identical.

The period for purification after a birth or death is different for the various castes: Brahmans are considered purified after a period of ten days, Kshatriyas after twelve, Vaishyas after fifteen, and Sudras after a period of thirty days following the occurrence of a birth or death. Throughout Bengal, and in many parts of Behar and Tirhoot, the Kayasthas are still purified after 30 days as laid down for the Sudras.

At the Dewali and Dusserah the Kayasthas affirm that they worship swords and guns along with the pen—the Kshatriyas, on the other hand, worship bows and arrows, kettle-drums, horses and elephants along with books.

The janeu, or sacred thread, is not generally used by the Kayasthas; the Kshatriyas rigidly observe the custom of wearing it.

As regards learning the Vedas, it may be unhesitatingly stated that no Kayastha could ever have the Basant Puja (recitation of the Vedic hymns) performed in his house, *e.g.*, at Benares.

Many of the twice-born classes will not partake of food and drink which has been contaminated by the touch of a Kayastha.

It is an undeniable fact that the Brahmans who accept presents from the Kayasthas in Bengal are excommunicated, and dishonoured with the appellation of "Sudra-yachi," (*i e.*, beggars dependent on Sudras).

"One section of Kayasthas in Upper India (Saksena Kayasthas) employ Mahomedan servants in their households as hukabardars."[18]

The use of the surname Das is common with the Kayasthas, and their feminine names, without a single exception, terminate in Dasi.

18. Calcutta Review, Vol. XCI, No. 181. p. 55.

5.—The Opinions of European Writers

The following are the conclusions on the status of the Kayasthas arrived at by European ethnologists and investigators, from practically the beginning of the 19th Century to its close; they all point to a mixed origin or to a low status allowed to them in the ancient four-fold division of caste.

Sir John Malcolm: "This tribe (*i e.*, the Kayasthas) had few religious scruples, as they stand low on the scale of Hindus."[19]

James Skinner, in his Persian book, written in 1825, says :—

احوال قوم شودر یعنی کایسته ازروئی پدم پوران و گرڑ پوران
ومها بھارت وبائی پوران ·

Translation :—"The description of the Sudra caste, that is, of Kayasthas, according to the Padum, the Vai, the Garud Purans, and the Mahabharat."

Professor Colebrooke :—"The appellation of Cayastha (Cait) is in general considered as synonymous with Carana, and accordingly the Caran tribe commonly assumes the name of Cayastha; but the Cayastha of Bengal have pretensions to be considered as true Sudras, which the "Jatimala" seems to authorise; for the origin of the Cayastha is there mentioned, before the subject of mixed tribes is introduced, immediately after describing the Gopa as a true Sudra."[20]

Sir H. M. Elliot writes :—The Kayath class occupies an intermediate place, and is variously reckoned as the only representative of the true Sudra caste, and as one of the mixed classes."[21]

Professor Cowell gives the following foot-note on the word "Cayets :" "A caste of Sudras ;" and further, says,—"the Cayets . . are (in Bengal

19. "Memoir of Central India," 1823, Vol. II., p. 165.
20. "Asiatic Researches," Vol. V, p. 58.
21. "Races of the N.-W. P." 1869, Vol. I, App. C. to Pt. I., p. 325.

at least) pure Sudras to whom their profession has descended from ancient times."[22]

Rev. Sherring says of the Kayasthas: "The writer caste comes somewhere at the head of the Sudras or between them and the Vaisyas."[23]

Sir Denzil Ibbetson, quoting Mr. Barnes, says: "The Kayastha of the plains is a Sudra, and is not entitled to assume a Janeo."[24]

Mr. Risley's opinion, quoted by Mr. Crooke, runs thus:—"This class would naturally have been recruited more largely from the peaceful Vaishyas and Sudras, than from the warlike Kshatriyas, while the Brahmans would probably have held aloof from it altogether."[25]

Mr. Crooke's opinion:—"It is, of course, not difficult to do, as some advocates of a higher status for the caste than others are disposed to admit have done, to produce texts in support of their views; but it is obvious that the question cannot be settled by reference to writings, the authority of some of which is not quite free from suspicion."

6.—Judicial and other Decisions.

In addition to the above opinions of European scholars on Indian caste, there are the authoritative decisions of one of the highest tribunals of justice in the country. The Calcutta High Court has, on more than one occasion, pronounced the Kayasthas to be Sudras. In the case of Raj Coomar Lal and others *vs.* Bisheshwar Dayal (1884) the point arose in connection with a question of inheritance, and the decision refers to the Sri Vastava Kayasthas of Behar who are connected by marriage with, and do

---

22. Elphinstone's "History of India," ed. by Prof. Cowell, 1874, pp. 59—61.
23. "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. I, ch. VIII, p. 305.
24. "Punjab Ethnography," 1883, para 560.
25. "Tribes and Castes of the N.-W. P., Oudh," Vol. III, p. 185.

not differ from, their caste-fellows in the United Provinces.[26] In a still more recent case, Ram Lal Shookool *vs.* Akhoy Charan Mitra (1903), the question was one of marriage and legitimacy, and it was held that the Kayasthas of Bengal are Sudras.[27] These judicial decisions, on a matter unsettled by an Act, are as authoritative as an enactment; and unless and until they are dissented from by other tribunals of equal standing they are binding on all subordinate Courts. In the eye of the law, therefore, Kayasthas are nothing more than Sudras.

The Vyawasthas, or opinions of assemblies of Pandits, which are cited by the Kayasthas in support of their contention, are of no value as evidence. "These Vyawasthas are not concordant, and the discrepancies (found among them) militate much against their weight.* There is no doubt that many of them were delivered after the accrual of controversy, and hence they are not admissible in evidence. Moreover, there is no evidence available to show under what circumstances the Pandits assembled, who convened their meeting, what was the necessity for it, and whether those who signed the Vyaswasthas had all the materials and were conversant with all the authorities necessary to draw just conclusions and form correct opinions. Again, the fact whether those who signed the Vyawasthas were Kayastha mercenaries or not is unknown. Last of all, these Vyawasthas were based on Puranic legends and

---

26. "Indian Law Reports," 10 Calcutta, p. 688 (1884). See also I. L. R. 6, Cal. p. 381.

27. "Calcutta Weekly Notes," Vol. VII, p. 619 (1903)

* See the book compiled in 1873 by Pandit Lakshmi Narain and Pandit Ram Charan at the request of Munshi Nawbut Rai, a Kayastha by caste and the then tehsildar of Futtehpore in the district of Nawabganj in Oudh, and published at the "Newal Kishore" Press at Lucknow. Vyawasthas both for and against the Kayastha claims have been given by the Pandits of Benares. The pamphlets written by Pandit Hari Krishna and Pandit Lakshmi Narain, entitled "Kayastha Kshatriyatva Drum Kuthar," or "An axe at the root of the Kayastha claim to Kahatriya origin," published at Benares in 1877, will throw much light on this subject.

ignored Manu's Shastra, which is regarded as next in sanctity to the Vedas, and was written long before the Purans, which have no great authority on questions of law, and this shows they do not command much respect and are valueless as evidence."[28] "The Pandits support the pretensions of a few castes to a higher rank than has hitherto been accorded to them . . . . by the fiction that their true origin has hitherto been misunderstood, and by indentifying them with some ancient caste of greater respectability than their own." [29.]

7.—The Kayasthas in the Census of 1901.

The Census Report of 1901 of the N.-W. P. and Oudh says:—

"*Group IV.—Castes Allied to Kshattriyas, &c.*"

"In accordance with the majority of the reports only a single caste, the Kayastha, should be placed in this group. Four committees would place it in the third group, while four would place it lower down, three are doubtful as to its proper position, and 25 have classed it in this group. There is, however, no doubt that while the majority have placed them as stated above, Kayasthas are not ordinarily regarded as allied to Kshattriyas. The full heading of this group also included those 'who claim to be Kshattriyas, and who are considered to be of high social standing, though their claim is not universally admitted,' and the Kayastha has been shown here as coming under that head . . . . There is not the slightest doubt that the Kayasthas are commonly regarded either as a mixed caste, with relationship

---

28. "The Origin of Kayasthas," II, 'Pioneer," 15th February 1902.
29 "Bengal Census Rpeort," 1901, p. 366.

to two if not three of the twice-born castes, or as Sudras. This is openly stated in some of the reports, and not a single Hindu who was not a Kayastha of the many I have personally asked about the matter would admit privately that the Kayasthas are twice-born, and the same opinion was expressed by Mahomedans who were in a position to gauge the ordinary ideas held by Hindus and are entirely free from prejudice in the matter . . . .
There is also a widespread belief that the observance by Kayasthas of the ceremonies prescribed for the twice-born which is now admitted to be general is comparatively recent, especially in the matter of the wearing of the sacred thread. . . . .
The traditional occupation of the Kayasthas tells against them in spite of the accounts of their origin."[30]

In Bengal, where the Kayastha caste is more numerous than in any other part of India, the Census Superintendent classes them as a "twice-born" caste (whether Kshatriya or Vaishya is not stated) without any reasons being given for the decision—at the same time a Hindu authority of the 16th century is quoted to the effect that "of all Sat Sudras the Kayastha is declared to be the best!"[31]

---

30. "Census Report, 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh.," Pt. I, pp. 222, 223.
31. "Bengal Census Report," Part I, p. 381.

PART IV.

THE JATS AND KURMIS

PART IV.

THE JATS AND KURMIS.

I.—THE JATS.

1.—Some Jat Customs.

The Jats have, like many another caste, put forward claims to a Kshatriyanic origin; but their present position and the existence among them of certain institutions and practices justify the conclusion that, from a caste point of view, they are of low origin or of mixed descent.

Widow marriage (*Dhrija or Karao*) and polyandry are both found among the Jats. They freely admit that the drija prevails among them, but the existence of polyandry is indignantly denied. It is true that the former is more general than the latter, but the existence of polyandry cannot be disproved.

Dr. Hunter writes:—"Thus, in the Punjab, among the Jat families too poor to bear the marriage expenses of all the males, the wife of the eldest son has sometimes to accept her brothers-in-law as joint husbands."[1]

Mr. C. S. Kirkpatrick is of the same opinion. The following is a quotation from his paper published in the "Indian Antiquary":—"and from his (Punjabi Jat's) replies, as well as from subsequent inquiries, I have ascertained that there exists at this present time a system of polyandry among the Jats . . . . . When a Jat is well-to-do he generally procures a wife for each of his sons, but if he is not rich enough to bear the expenses of

1. "Indian Empire," p. 614.

many marriages he gets a wife for the eldest son only, and she is expected to, and as a rule does, accept her brothers-in-law as co-husbands."[2]

Mr. Crooke says:—" Polygamy is allowed, and all Jats agree that polyandry is abominable. But there seems reason to believe that in some cases it prevails."[3]

These two systems (widow marriage and polyandry) are opposed to the true and orthodox system of marriage prevalent among the dwija (twice-born) classes of the Hindu community. Though widow marriage is tolerated among the lower classes, polyandry is never permitted even amongst the lowest of the low.

The Jats are also given to ancestor-worship, which is admittedly a non-Aryan custom. On this point Mr. Crooke observes:—" Jats are also much addicted to ancestor-worship, and have many such shrines in their villages."[4]

The Punchayet system is also found among the Jats as among the other Sudras; and "Jats, Gujars, and Ahirs smoke and drink together."[5] This proves at least a close relationship, if not a common origin, between them.

2.—Their Origin and Social Position.

There are several theories about the origin of the Jats, and much ingenuity and learning have been brought to bear on the subject. In the extract already given from Professor Cowell's edition of Elphinstone's "History of India" (*vide* Appendix A. p., 25) will be found his view of the probable Scythian origin of the Jats; and "we know from the "Zafarnama" of Sharifuddin that Timur, when he invaded India,

2. " Indian Antiquary," Vol VII, p. 86.
3. " Tribes and Castes of the N-W. P. and Oudh," Vol. III, p. 6.
4. *Ibid*, Vol. III, p. 39.
5. "Census Report," 1865, App. B., p. 14.

believed the Jats of the Punjab to be of the same race as the Tartars whom he met in Central Asia."[6]

Colonel Tod remarks :—" In all the catalogues of the thirty-six Royal Races of India the Jat has a place, though by none is he ever styled 'Rájput,' nor am I aware of any instance of a Rajput's intermarriage with a Jat." In another passage he says :—"They (the Jats) were utter aliens to the Hindu theocracy."[7] From these quotations it is evident that, though the Jats are included among the thirty-six Royal Races, the Rajputs had nothing to do with them, and that they were never treated or acknowledged as Rajputs. The mere fact of the Jats being included in the list of the thirty-six Royal Races of India is no proof that they were Rajputs ; there is a large number of Kshatriya or Rajput clans who, though by no means inferior in origin or in caste status, are not named in this list, because, in the first place, the ancestors of some of them did not exercise the same amount of sovereign power within historic times, and, secondly, because some of them are later offshoots of the thirty-six Royal Races. The Jats are found in this list because some of their race also held sway to some extent in former times.

Sir Denzil Ibbetson is of opinion that Rajputs and Jats now form a common stock, the distinction between them being social rather than ethnic.[8] But in the Punjab, where the social rules as to eating and drinking are so lax, if a social distinction exists up to this day, it is a strong argument in favour of an ethnical difference. Sir Denzil Ibbetson's theory, however, is of little value because it is possible that the Jats might have descended from the Rajputs ; at all events it cannot obviously be of general application, unless it is proved that there was a time when the

6. Sir H. M. Elliot's "Races of the N.-W. P.," Vol. I, p. 319.
7. Tod's "Rajasthan."
8. "Punjab Ethnography," 1883, p. 220.

Punjabi Jats and the Rajputs were one and the same people. The result of Sir Denzil Ibbetson's investigations cannot therefore be accepted as conclusive. Further, it may be urged that an illegitimate descent would produce an ethnical similarity between the parent stock and the offspring.

The ethnical theory of Sir Denzil Ibbetson merely proves, if it proves anything, that the Punjabi Jats have some Rájput blood in their veins, but the theory loses its force altogether when it is acknowledged that the Jats have admitted a large number of degraded and excommunicated Rajputs into their community. On this the Census Report of 1865 says of the Jats :—" Increasing their numbers by admitting degraded and excommunicated Rajputs to the tribe, and marrying women of almost every class."[9]

The same Report says that the Jats are a subsidiary caste. They are the offspring of an improper union between a Chhatri and a woman of an inferior caste, which degrades them from the rank enjoyed by their primitive fathers. "The Jats do not wear the sacred thread, and have among them certain customs which are more like those of the Sudras than of the twice-born castes . . . . . . The Jats themselves claim to be Kshatriyas. But as they do not wear the sacred thread, they are usually looked upon as having the status of only clean Sudras. There cannot therefore be intermarriage between Jats and Rajputs." [10] The Jats must therefore be relegated to the category of the castes having a mixed origin, and consequently of a low position.

3.—The Jats in the Census of 1901.

The Census Report for the N.-W. P and Oudh, 1901, says :—"Of the other castes that claim to be

9. "Census Report," 1865, Appendix B., p. 36.
10. Bhattacharya's " Hindu Castes and Sects," p. 145.

placed in the third or fourth groups (Kshatriyas and Castes allied to Kshatriyas, etc.), the Jats have perhaps the best claim. Nine committees, however, reject this, while four would place them in the fourth group. The Jats are excellent cultivators and soldiers, and the Maharaja of Bharatpur belongs to this caste, but the re-marriage of widows is openly allowed by the caste, and in fact supported by references to the Shastras, and this is sufficient in public opinion to refute the claim."[11]

The Report of the Punjab Census, 1901, has the following remarks on the claim of the Jats to be considered Kshatriyas :—" Neither territorial sovereignty, nor the avoidance of widow re-marriage, nor refusal of the bride-price will raise a Jat tribe to the status of a Rajput, a fact all the more remarkable in that many Jat tribes have traditions of Rajput origin."[12]

II. THE KURMIS.

1.—Their Origin and Position.

The Kurmis also claim to be descended from the ancient Kshatriyas. Their claim, however, is based on no firmer ground than the name of a Rishi called Kurma mentioned in one of the Purans. He is said to have been of the Kshatriya caste, but there is no mention whatever of his descendants. There is not a single circumstance to connect the Kurmis with the Rishi Kurma, and the mere similarity of name is no ground for connecting this caste with the Kshatriyas. It is purely a fanciful theory, and must be rejected.

Judging from their present position, and their customs and manners, it is quite clear that they enjoy no higher a status than the Ahirs and such other agricultural tribes. All the writers on the

11. "Census Report," 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh, Part I, p. 224.
12. "Census Report," 1901, Punjab, Part I, p. 324.

castes and tribes of India have mentioned this caste, but not one of them has ever even hinted at their being Kshatriyas or Dwijas.

Sir Denzil Ibbetson, who classes them under "Menials," says:—"The Kurmi or Kumbhi is a great caste of cultivators very widely distributed over the eastern parts of Hindustan and the Deccan." "A good caste is the Kunbin; with hoe in hand she weeds the field together with her husband." But in the cantonments of the Punjab they are generally occupied like other Purbis, in cutting grass, weaving, and serving as grooms; and they are even said to keep pigs. They are of course a very low caste; lower far in social standing than our indigenous agricultural castes."

Colonel Tod includes them among the agricultural and pastoral class, along with Ahirs, Gawals, and others.

In the Census Report of 1865 their origin is described thus:—"Kurmi—The son of a bondswoman of a Chhattree named Buttoo, married the daughter of a bondsman of a Vais, and lived with his father-in-law, whose protection he, however, did not desire. Afterwards he withdrew, and betook himself to agriculture and trade. The word Kurmee, in Sanskrit, means 'one who supports himself by his own earnings;' and this was the case with the originator of this caste.[2]" "Kurmi—Described as the descendants of a slave-girl and an illegitimate son of a Chhattree.[3]" "Kurmies—An Ahir had four sons, *viz.*:—Bin, Koormee, Palind, and Nekhad—and the succeeding generation of these four sons formed four different castes."[4] "Koormees—Buttoo, the son of a Chhattree slave-girl married the daughter of a Vaishya slave-girl. His descendants followed the profession of cultivating

1. "Punjab Ethnography," 1883, para. 663.
2. "Census Report," 1865, Appendix B., p. 42.
3. *Ibid*, p. 71.
4. *Ibid*. p. 116.

land, and were called Koormees from the meaning of that word in Sanskrit 'to earn one's own livelihood.'"

Mr. Crooke's opinion about this caste can be ascertained from the following passage :—"On the whole, perhaps, it is safest for the present to regard them as an occupational caste, from which has, at various times, diverged a series of kindred castes, such as the Koeri, Kachhi, Saini, Mali and others connected with the higher forms of husbandry."[5]

Mr. Sherring calls them pure Sudras :—"Kunbi —The agricultural caste. It is known by this name or by that of Kumbhi, or Kurmi, in most parts of India. These people are pure Sudras."[6]

They practise widow marriage, called *dhrija* or *karao*. Mr. Crooke says :—"Widow marriage and the optional levirate, under the usual restriction that the elder brother of the late husband is barred, generally prevails."[7] Generally speaking, there is no purdah system among the Kurmis, and they are not entitled to wear the sacred thread.

All the facts and circumstances connected with the Kurmis unmistakeably prove them to be Sudras of the same position as the Ahirs and the Kachhis, and there is not a tittle of evidence to connect them in any way with the Kshatriyas.

2.—The Kurmis in the Census of 1901.

The Census Report for the N.-W. P. and Oudh, 1901, says:—

"The Kurmis have also been placed by 24 committees in a lower position than that which they claim, and only four would place them in the fourth group (Castes allied to Kshatriyas, etc.), while two would class them in the sixth (Castes allied to Vaishyas or Banias). Here again the fact that

5. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes," Vol. III, p. 348.
6. Sherring's "Hindu Tribes and Castes," Vol. II, p. 187.
7. Crooke's "Tribes and Castes," Vol. III, p. 352

widow marriage is openly tolerated by a large proportion of the caste is looked on as a mark of inferiority, and the formation of new sections by members who desired to rise in the social scale, the characteristic of which is the refusal to recognize the remarriage of widows, has already been referred to."[8]

In the recent report of the Census of India, 1901, the following remarks occur on the caste status of the Kurmis:—"The Awadhia or Ayodhya Kurmis of Bihar and the Kanaujia Kurmis of the United Provinces pride themselves on prohibiting the remarriage of widows and are endeavouring to establish a shadowy title to be recognized as some variety of Kshatriya. . . . . But although the Awadhias have achieved complete practical separation from the main body of Kurmis, no one accepts them as Kshatriyas or Rajputs."[9]

8. "Census Report," 1901, N.-W. P. and Oudh, Part I, p. 224.
9. "Census of India," 1901, Vol. I, p. 529.

